

THE STANDARD

NO. 118---VOL. V, NO. 14.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1889.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD advocates the abolition of all taxes upon industry and the products of industry, and the taking, by taxation upon land values irrespective of improvements, of the annual rental value of all those various forms of natural opportunities embraced under the general term, Land.

We hold that to tax labor or its products is to discourage industry.

We hold that to tax land values to their full amount will render it impossible for any man to exact from others a price for the privilege of using those bounties of nature in which all living men have an equal right of use; that it will compel every individual controlling natural opportunities to either utilize them by the employment of labor, or abandon them to others; that it will thus provide opportunities of work for all men, and secure to each the full reward of his labor; and that as a result involuntary poverty will be abolished, and the greed, intemperance and vice that spring from poverty and the dread of poverty will be swept away.

HENRY GEORGE IN ENGLAND.

LONDON, March 23.—One of the most suggestive sights I have seen in London was in a committee room of the house of lords last week. Seven lords were seated round a horseshoe table at one end of the room. The official stenographer, the Rev. Harold Rylett, who was acting as a sort of counsel in presenting the case of the nail and chain makers, and a trades union secretary, who was being examined, were in the center. Then came the press table, at which I sat, with a row of reporters, and at the other end of the room opposite the lords was a bench on which were seated some chain and nail makers, women and girls. Upper, middle and lower classes, we only wanted a prince of the royal blood and a few paupers, to secure in that small room a full representation of the gradations of English society.

I had never had such a close view of so many lords before, and their faces were interesting to me, not that they differed from ordinary faces, but because it was interesting to speculate what I would have taken each of them for if I had met him on the top of an omnibus or in a railway train. Lord Dunraven, who was chairman of the committee, seemed the quickest and sharpest of the lot. He is evidently an energetic man, and doubtless could have made a pretty good living as a commercial traveler had the accident of birth not made him a lord. The duke of Norfolk, who sat next to him, is one of the richest of the English peers. He owns among other items the town of Sheffield, and very productive mineral lands. He has royal blood in his veins, is hereditary earl marshal of the kingdom, and his rank gives him the position of the leading Catholic layman in the queen's dominions. Still, if one were to judge from his face, rank and wealth and power have not exempted him from the cares and strains and sorrows of life. So with the others. As I amused myself with mentally putting them in the garb and situation of stokers, porters, costermongers and tradesmen, it was evident that they were of the same flesh, blood and mental characteristics as the millions of their fellows. Yet they were all hereditary law makers, and belonged hereditarily to the class which consumes without producing. And then, changing my position a little, it interested me, while listening to the testimony, to scan the faces at the other end of the room. Poorly developed and shabbily dressed as they were, the young women and girls (I infer there are no old women in these occupations) had good, bright faces, and surrounding them in imagination with the advantages of their favored sisters, one could see plainly that nature had been no more niggard with

them than with the average of the women who are the ornaments and flowers of the highest society.

It was curious and suggestive to me, this sight. For what was it at bottom? A committee of amiable wolves, sitting in solemn inquiry upon the untimely mortality among sheep, but always shutting out any reference to the vulpine taste for mutton. One of the witnesses, the white-haired secretary of a Black country trades union, took out of a carpet bag specimens of the nails and spikes made by hand labor in the Black country. An enormous spike such as is used in ship building, he held up. This, he said, was one of a number made by a young married woman who worked at making them until a short time before she became a mother and then died within a week. And other similar stories he told as he held up spikes of different degrees of bigness—spikes made at the cost of health and life. The women and the girls gave their testimony—testimony as to hard work, long hours and small pay, and of the deductions from their earnings which the middle man made. Models of a machine called the "oliver," a heavy hammer worked by jumping on it with both feet, which is used by the spike makers, were also brought up by Mr. Rylett and were shown.

The lords were evidently sympathetic and seemed really desirous of doing something, or recommending something, which would improve the condition of these down trodden white slaves—anything, in fact, as Tolstoi has said, *but getting off their backs*. That never seemed to enter their heads. So far as I could judge from the questions, their only idea of helping the chain makers was by more restriction—by prohibitions and inspections to prevent women and children from making nails over a certain size.

Yet the two classes who sat facing each other at the two ends of that room were complementaries. Between the lords who labored not and the children who labored too much and too soon, there was a connection of cause and effect. On the one side of that narrow room were women and children who must labor long hours at toil so exhausting that it uses up women in a few years, and in a few years more uses up men, yet who get so little of the produce of labor that even for the short years of their life they can barely maintain it. On the other side were men who never did any productive labor in their lives, whose fathers never did any productive labor, and whose fathers' fathers, as far as they care to trace them, never did any productive labor, yet who enjoy in the utmost abundance all the produce of labor. Widely diverging branches from the same root, their connection is yet so clear that one must indeed shut his eyes not to see it. The lords are lords, not in empty title, but in the power of appropriating the proceeds of other people's labor—a power which is theirs, because theirs is the land, without which no man can live. And the landlord implies the landless—those who, having no legal right to live and work, must pay by giving up their labor, or the produce of their labor, for the privilege of living and working. On the one side of this room were representatives of the privileged class; on the other representatives of one of the lowest strata of the disinherited classes—not the

lowest, indeed, for lower even are the chain makers of Cradley Heath, who are a class only saved from starvation by degrading charity. Why these chain-makers are poor, why they must work so hard for such a pittance, is clear. They have no right whatever in the soil of England; no right whatever in the natural elements which are essential to all life and necessary to all work. Powerless to employ themselves, they must go into the labor market to compete with others as helpless as themselves for permission to get a living—a competition in which the ignorant and weak are necessarily trodden down.

That appropriation of natural opportunities as the private property of a class, which gives "my lords" of the sweating commission their rents and royalties, is what on the other hand robs the mere laborers of the natural earnings of their toil, deprives them of the capital that in natural conditions labor would accumulate, and makes them so helpless in the stress of the fierce competition that they are bled and preyed upon by others of their own kind.

How absurd it is when one comes to actually think of it, these attempts to cure the evils of overwork by prohibiting overwork! As though work in itself were some hurtful but pleasant thing that the devil prompts people to engage in, and from which they must be restrained by the strong arm of the law. These poor women do not make spikes for the love of making spikes, nor are children set to such work because either the children themselves or their parents enjoy the untimely wearing away of their lives. Women and children in the Black country would no more make sookes and chains beyond their strength, if they were as free, than do the women and children of the nobility. Behind this wearing toil is the pressure of an evil to which it seems less. Men, women and children are being driven as it were by fire to jump into water, and the only remedy a large and most influential class have to propose is simply to wall in the water so that the people cannot drown themselves.

The lords of the committee, however, have not gone through this investigation without hearing something of a better and more far reaching remedy than factory acts and inspectorships. In his examination the Rev. Harold Rylett, whose church at Dudley is in the midst of that part of the Black country where these chain and nail makers live and toil, told the lords that the problem that was really before them was simply the great labor problem. He told them that the condition of these chain and nail makers was merely the condition of the working people of their kind generally, exaggerated somewhat by peculiar circumstances of trade and locality, and that the only true remedy would be to tax land values, thereby opening the land of the country to freer and easier use. He told them that it would be impossible to enable the seller of labor to make a really free contract unless all men were to be on an equal level of access to natural opportunities.

But the lords did not care to press the inquiry in this direction. They merely smiled, and turned by their questions another way.

But although the direct results are little the indirect results of such inquiries

as that upon the sweating system are effecting much good by arousing thought and stimulating discussion.

This week, to avoid discussing the question in parliament at this session, the government has promised Mr. Burt to grant a commission of inquiry into the matter of mining royalties. This will prove one of the most interesting investigations that have yet been made, and by giving some idea of the great sums which the mining interests of Great Britain are compelled to pay to the men who claim the ownership, not merely of the surface, but of all that is below the surface, will greatly stimulate the movement for the single tax.

Of late years women have been coming to the front in England even more rapidly than with us. They already vote at school board and municipal elections, and people are becoming accustomed to see them taking part in public affairs.

In the London school board, Miss Helen Taylor was, until her retirement, a most influential member, and Mrs. Annie Besant and Mrs. Ashton Dilke are influential members of the present board. To the new London county council Miss E. J. C. Cobden, the daughter of the great free trade apostle, was elected from Bow and Bromley, and Lady M. Sandhurst from Brixton; while among the twenty aldermen chosen by the elected members of the council was Miss Alderman Emma Cons.

In the last parliamentary election the Primrose dames took an important part, and in the recent struggle in Kennington the liberal and radical women in the district interested themselves as much as the tory women, and seem to be doing so in the Enfield election now beginning.

The presence of women in the county council is, however, not passing unchallenged, and the reservation of opinion in the high court of justice in the contest of Beresford Hope (recently defeated for parliament in the Kennington election by the liberal candidate Mark Beaufoy) for the seat of Lady Sandhurst, is supposed to indicate a decision adverse to the right of women to sit. Such a decision, however, by the agitation it would lead to, would be more likely to advance than to retard the woman's rights movement. And in the meantime other influences are pressing it on.

It seems startling to think of woman suffrage becoming an accomplished fact in Great Britain within two or three years. And yet this is one of the things which the present political situation may bring about. The tories have found in the Primrose league an efficient auxiliary, and the hard working Primrose dames perceptibly contributed to their success in the last general election. Lord Salisbury declared distinctly for woman suffrage in a speech made in Scotland last year, and many of the tory members are pledged to it. At the time these pledges were made there was probably little thought of carrying them out, but now the idea seems to be growing among the conservative ranks that since women are so largely conservative, to bring them into the electorate would be the most effectual way of "dishing the whigs." The idea certainly frightens many of the radical politicians. With the present electorate they feel certain of regaining power as soon as an appeal to the country is made. But if the women are

called in they fear that the new vote may swamp them.

Possibly they are right in this, though for my part I do not feel as certain of it as do the English liberals with whom I have talked upon the matter. But it is sure that if the tories in this way win a temporary victory, it will be at the cost of a permanent loss. For the sake of winning one battle they would be calling out and sacrificing their reserves. That in England, as in all other countries, women are to-day a great conservative power is in my mind due to the fact that their exclusion from the suffrage prevents the great body of them from taking any intelligent interest in public affairs; and to call upon them to vote would be to open their minds to progressive influences.

Women constitute one half of the human race, and certainly not the least important half. Their political power exists, whether it is openly exerted or not. If women do not vote themselves, they educate and largely mould the minds of men who do vote. And I believe Helen Taylor is right when she declares that the great part of the flippancy of public thought on political and social questions—a great part of the difficulty in obtaining a general and intelligent discussion of the most important matters—arises from the fact that women are accustomed to think that they have nothing to do with such things. As mothers, daughters, sweethearts, wives or friends, women, actively or passively, largely affect the opinions and control the actions of men, and nothing can fully rouse the interest of men unless it also arouses the interest of women. Conservatism might be temporarily strengthened by such a sudden extension of the franchise. But by the extension of discussion and arousing of thought this would cause conservatism would, from that moment, begin to lose strength in the very sources and reservoirs of its power.

If the tory leaders decide upon playing this last card, and "dishing the whigs" by the support of a measure so radical that only the most advanced radicals have hitherto thought of it as a practical question, they can hardly count upon the support of their full majority in the house. But on the other hand the full opposition vote could not be brought to oppose such a measure, and anything like a fair prospect of its passage would make it a very serious matter for members who hope for re-election to place themselves in opposition to the extension of the suffrage to a class likely soon to number the half of their constituents. As the passage of such an act will necessitate a general election, this influence will be strong.

That female suffrage is thus brought to the very verge of practical politics is one of the most striking evidences of the rapidity with which events are moving in England, and between now and the close of the century no man can tell what may occur.

It is certainly more than possible that in the very next general election women may vote as well as men, and that when the next parliament assembles representatives of the sex who up to this time have only been permitted to look down on the commons through the bars of a cage may take their seats on the benches of the house.

On the 15th of April the matter will come up in the house of commons, that being the day set aside for the consideration of two bills, one introduced by Mr. Woodhall (Gladstonian), member for Hanley, which provides for the extension of the suffrage to women not under cover, and the other a bill by Mr. McLaren (Gladstonian), member for Cheshire, pro-

viding that in all acts relative to the franchise, words referring to the male sex shall be understood as including the female sex also. The latter measure would at one stroke put the political power of the British empire into the hands of women, for, as the census shows, there is a clear majority of women—some half a million if I recollect aright—in the three kingdoms.

The women suffragists have been holding a conference in London during the week and had a large meeting in the Prince's hall, Piccadilly, on Thursday night, both Mr. Woodhall and Mr. McLaren being present. It was very clear that the sentiment of the meeting was entirely with Mr. McLaren. The notion of depriving women of the vote because they are married is so preposterous in itself, and is open to so many telling attacks, that the real struggle is certain to come over Mr. McLaren's proposition.

The bill is not likely to pass at this session, but it begins to look as though the British empire were within measurable distance of a resolution that, with a woman on the throne and a majority of women in the electorate, would put the ultimate political power in the hands of women.

That the women in their new found power might do some foolish things is probable. But it is certain that they cannot do more foolish things than the men have done. And though at first they may stand in the way of some reforms that are on the verge of accomplishment, it is certain that they will ultimately call for larger reforms. Perhaps the sentiment which the song so popular some forty years ago put in the mouth of the French maid might govern them:

If I were king of France,
Or, still better, pope of Rome,
There should be no fighting men abroad,
No weeping maids at home;
All the world should be at peace,
And each should have his right,
And they who made the quarrels
Should be the ones to fight!

One of the most notable things at the woman suffrage meeting was that Sir A. K. Rollit (conservative M. P. for the south division of Islington) said that the land question was the most important and far reaching question before the country and the women suffrage question was next to it, and that his remark provoked great applause.

Prominent and active among the London single tax men is our New Yorker, Silas M. Burroughs of Medina, Orleans county. Like all of us who have fully "seen the cat," he is really a citizen of the world, and no matter on which side of the Atlantic he may be, works away for the good of the cause. He and I spoke together in Brooklyn for Cleveland just before the election, and then he went home to Medina to do what he could to bring out the Cleveland vote. A night or two after the election he opened the new campaign in Medina by a thoroughgoing free trade, single tax speech; and since he has been back here he has been working as hard as though he were a native Englishman for the propagation of our principles here. Nor have I heard of the slightest objection being made to his taking part in English politics because he is an American. On the contrary, he has just been elected president of the Liberal and Radical association at Dartford in West Kent. On being asked to accept the presidency Mr. Burroughs sent the association a letter clearly defining his position. He stated that he was in favor of government by the people and for the people, that he believed in union with home rule, in one vote for one man, in the public assumption of election expenses, in the payment of members of

legislative bodies, and in free public schools. Then he went on:

I am a radical in the sense of desiring to go to the roots of injustice and to tear them up as noxious weeds, and in believing in the radical as distinct from the palliative treatment of injustice. I am, therefore, in favor of the removal of all customs duties and of the shifting of taxation from industry and its products to land values. The taxation of industry hinders and represses it, preventing men from employing themselves, and reducing the production of wealth. It affords an excuse for leaving land values untaxed, and thus allowing land owners to take as their own values created by the growth and improvement of the community. Thus industry is impoverished and thirst is fined, while idleness is rewarded and enriched.

I regard the present distress among the working classes and their low wages as caused by legislation which has taxed the people for the benefit of the landlords, and am in favor of taxing the *value* of land, whether used or not—such a tax as would compel the owner to use the land himself or dispose of it to some one who would. This would greatly stimulate the demand for labor and avoiding the taxation on improvements of every kind, would greatly encourage them.

No one who had improved and made good use of his land would suffer by a transfer of taxation from the improvements as at present to the land value. If the improvements, as drains, fences, buildings, etc., were of greater value than the land, he would pay less taxes and be free to spend any amount in labor and improvements without having to pay a higher tax.

The single tax on land values would simply take for public purposes values created by and justly belonging to the public, making all other taxation unnecessary. It would prevent the monopolizers of natural opportunities from levying a toll upon their fellow beings for the bounties of nature created for all, and would realize the equal right of all to the works of the Creator, thus carrying out the Scriptural dictum, "the use of the earth is for all."

How well this declaration of principles suited the Liberal and radical association of Dartmouth may be inferred from the fact that upon its reading they unanimously elected Mr. Burroughs president.

Alfred Saunders, a brother of William Saunders of London, was elected in January to the New Zealand parliament from the Lincoln district in South Canterbury. He ran as an out and out free trader against a popular protectionist, making the fight on that issue and receiving more than two-thirds of the votes cast.

Samuel Saunders, the eldest of the three brothers, ran in the county councils' elections for the council of Wiltshire, against Mr. Bouvierie, the great landlord of the locality. The return showed him defeated by a small majority, but the ballots were kept some fourteen hours before being counted and from their appearance there was more than a strong suspicion that on a number of them the lead pencil mark Saunders had been rubbed out and a cross for Bouvierie substituted.

So far as the ballot itself is concerned, the English election law hardly leaves anything to be desired, but their methods of counting are hardly as good as ours in New York, while the registration system is very bad. The registration list of the last election is generally used; and in the towns this tells very powerfully against the working classes, a large proportion of whom are constantly changing their places of residence. The radical demand of "one man, one vote," suggests another great advantage which the propertied classes have, in being allowed to vote not merely where they live, but also wherever they own or even rent real estate, so that one man may easily have half a dozen votes.

Every time I come to London I find myself for the first day or two wondering at the goodness of the streets, at the great loads the horses pull, and at the pace at which street traffic moves along. When we got away from the railroad station on the night of our arrival, I found myself in a one-horse cab, containing four inside and two outside, and with its top so filled and piled with luggage that I feared it

would break through. In the streets of New York one horse would hardly have been able to move such a load, but this animal trotted away as easily as he would in New York with a third or fourth of it. The great omnibuses drawn by two horses and filled on the tops, as well as inside, roll along the asphalt as easily as our street cars do, and nothing could be pleasanter or easier than the London hansom. If the great body of Americans could once see such streets they would no longer tolerate the pavements we have in New York, or still less such pavements as are one of the greatest abominations of Philadelphia. That these pavements cost a great deal more than ours is true, but they effect such a saving in vehicles and in horseflesh, to say nothing of noise and jar, that even in money they must be a great economy.

The asphalt, such as exists in London, is the very ideal of paving so far as traction is concerned, but it has the disadvantage of being slippery to the feet of horses when it begins to rain, and the wooden pavement which is used in many of the streets is preferable on this account. The adoption of one uniform pavement for the whole of London is now being talked of, and the new county council will probably act in the matter. If the streets were uniformly paved with asphalt, then it would be possible to adopt some india-rubber shoe for horses which would overcome the only disadvantage that such pavements have, so long as horses are used.

Last Saturday night the new Radical club entertained me at dinner at the Covent Garden hotel. The Radical club was formed by, and is chiefly composed of the more radical members of the National liberal club. The split in the liberal party between the Gladstonites and the nationalists has for some time prevented the National liberal club, which contains both in its membership, from taking much part in politics, and the new club is intended to form a nucleus for the concentration and effective action of the radical element inside the liberal party. A skeleton organization of the same kind has been made in the house of commons. It is evident that in the march of events it will not be long before there will come causes of difference and a struggle for supremacy between the right and left wings of the party now held together under Gladstone's leadership.

The gathering at the dinner, to which something over a hundred sat down, was of the active men—the new blood of the radical wing of the liberal party of London—and I was delighted with the evidence which it gave of the rapid spread of the single tax idea. The speeches were all strong and hopeful, and the sentiment of the company was clearly that the land question was the burning question of the day.

On Tuesday night I lectured at Bermondsey town hall. The meeting was under the auspices of five of the local radical clubs, and Dr. Cooper, one of the representatives of the district in the county council, was in the chair. On Wednesday night I spoke at Woolwich to a similar meeting, W. Martin Edwards, the liberal candidate for parliament, presiding. On Thursday I spoke at Stepney in the meeting hall of the Congregational church, where I delivered a lecture on Moses when I was in London some five years ago. Mr. B. T. L. Thompson, liberal candidate for parliament for Stepney, presided here. On Friday night I lectured at Edmonton, where an election contest is now going on for the seat made vacant by the promotion of its incumbent to the house of lords on the death of his father. A thoroughgoing single tax man, Mr. T. P. Wood, was in the chair here.

At all these meetings I had large audiences of the kind I would most prefer to talk to—composed mainly of the bone and sinew of the radical wing of the liberal party, with a sprinkling of conservatives, and in some places a few socialists. These meetings, as all I have yet addressed in London, seem to me very efficient and show a very remarkable advance in sentiment since I was here four years ago.

What I have been doing in London during these two weeks, in speaking in the various metropolitan districts, is work which does not show much in the great newspapers, for they report only the central meetings; but it has been reaching a class that could not be reached so well in any other way.

Next week I shall go into Wales. Here is a list of my engagements for the future, so far as they have yet been made:

South Wales—

Cardiff, March 26.
Newport, March 27.
Risca, March 28.
Swansea, March 29.

London—

Westminster Chapel, April 1.
Lambeth Baths, April 2.
Wandsworth, April 3.
Bethnal Green, April 4.
Stratford, April 5.

Midlands and North—

Nottingham, April 8.
Pudsey, April 9.
Bradford, April 10.
Bolton, April 11.
Ashton-under-Lyme, April 12.
Workington, April 13.
Newcastle, April 15.
Sunderland, April 16.
Consett, April 17.
Alnwick, April 18.
Ashington Colliery, April 20 and 21.

Scotland—

Edinburgh, April 22.
Galasheils, April 23.
Selkirk, April 24.
Dumfries, April 25.
Glasgow, April 27.
Glasgow, April 28.
Greenock, April 29.
Campbeltown, April 30.
Paisley, May 1.
Cumnock, May 2.
Dundee, May 6.
Aberdeen, May 7.
Wick, May 8.

Midlands—

Birmingham, May 12.
Wolverhampton, May 13.
Coventry, May 14.
Dudley, May 15.
Walsall, May 16.
Wednesbury, May 17.
Reading, May 20.
Oxford, May 21.

I was deeply grieved to learn of the murder of Captain Dawson. Although he did not say very much about it, regarding any agitation of the subject in South Carolina at present as hopeless, he was at heart a single tax man, and in 1880, when "Progress and Poverty" first came out, made an elaborate editorial review or rather synopsis of it, running through a number of issues of his paper, the Charleston News and Courier. It is sad that a career which gave such promise of usefulness should come to so untimely and tragic a close.

Our German friend, Michael Flursheim, is proposing to get up an international conference in Paris during the first week of July. The French minister of commerce offers us a hall in the exhibition building provided we shall discuss only the land question as related to agriculture. For my part I could not talk about the land question related to agriculture without speaking of it as related to manufacturing, mining and city population, but as

I can only speak in English it will perhaps not make so much difference in Paris. I will give you notice of the time set so that our American friends who are visiting Europe this year may be present. Mr. A. Van Deusen of New York is coming, I know, and I presume there will be a number of others. HENRY GEORGE.

THE NATION'S CRITICISM.

The New York Nation of last week contained an editorial article entitled "The reasons for private land ownership," in which, while conceding that "the single tax idea involves a practical proposition which deserves most serious consideration and which, within limits at any rate, has a great deal to be said in its favor," and while going even so far as to declare that "a reform which should take burdens off from invested capital and transfer them to the owners of ground rent would be a desirable one," it expresses the belief that the proposal of the more radical single tax men, those who accept what in contradistinction to the single tax idea it calls the "Henry George land theory," would do more harm than good. For the Nation, which is the weekly edition of the Evening Post, in which the article also appeared, this is a very mild expression of opposition; and it is impossible to avoid a suspicion that if the writer had understood the "land theory" he would have thought it also deserving of most serious consideration, and both a desirable and practicable reform.

Before considering the "Henry George land theory" as the Nation understands it, let us see what it is as Henry George presents it.

Why, in spite of increase in the power of producing wealth, do the wages of wealth producers tend to diminish? That is the problem. And here is the theory, "the land theory," if you please, by which Mr. George claims to have solved the problem:

Wages are paid out of the product of the labor for which they are paid; therefore, with increase of productive power they ought to increase, and if they do not, the answer must be sought in the laws of distribution.

In distribution, wealth falls partly into the classification of wages and interest, or compensation for the labor and capital employed, and partly into that of rent or return for the use of land. The proportion of product to be distributed as rent is determined by the excess of the produce of the land for which it is paid, over that which the same application can secure from the least productive land in use, or as it is termed, at the "margin of cultivation;" that is, in accordance with the Ricardian law of rent, a law that no thoughtful political economist disputes. This being the law of rent, interest and wages can be only so much of the product as the same application of the labor and capital for which they are paid could have secured from the least productive land in use, or at "the margin of cultivation." But the margin of cultivation naturally recedes as material progress advances; and expectation of material progress, by producing the effect of a combination among land owners, forces it farther than the necessities of production require. Thus, by the normal falling away of the "margin of cultivation," the share of wealth denominated rent is increased as a proportion, while that denominated wages and interest is of necessity diminished as a proportion; and the abnormal pressure upon "the margin of cultivation" through the withholding of land from its best use, diminishes wages and interest not only as a proportion but absolutely.

From these economic principles, in respect to none of which the Nation will venture to take issue, Mr. George concludes that the reason wages tend to diminish in spite of increase in productive power (being also the reason for the decline of interest), is that with increase in productive power rent tends to even greater increase.

But Mr. George did not stop with

theory. He was seeking a remedy for deplorable social conditions, and with him the theory was only a means of discovering the cause of that for which he sought a remedy. The cause once discovered, the remedy he proposed and which should be obvious to whoever has head enough to understand the theory and heart enough to want a remedy, was to make land common property.

Questions relating to the justice of this remedy Mr. George anticipated. He argued that as every man is the owner of what he produces, a title to land is robbery because it enables a non-producer to claim as rent part of the fruit of another's labor. He made clear the analogy of land ownership and slavery by showing that ownership of land involves ownership of men in greater or less degree. The question of prescriptive right he answered by showing that private ownership is not merely a robbery in the past, but, since rent is not drawn from the produce of the past but is a tax levied on labor constantly and continuously, that it is a robbery in the present—a fresh robbery every year. Finally, to meet the minor objection that land ought to be treated as private property because it had always been so treated, he replied that even if it were true that land had always been treated as private property this would prove neither the justice nor the necessity of continuing so to treat it, and asserted on the authority of famous investigators that historically as well as ethically private property in land is robbery because it has everywhere had its birth in force or fraud.

Mr. George did not propose common ownership, however, in the sense of common use. That is neither expedient nor necessary. Rent, the very attribute of land that under private ownership robs the producer and threatens civilization, offers the means of at once securing to the community the benefits of common ownership, and to the individual all the just protection that private ownership affords. If rent be taken for common use, the land itself may be safely and advantageously subjected to private control. Therefore, Mr. George's practical proposition was, not to make land common property, but to make rent common property; and as the method best adapted to our time and circumstances, he proposed to abolish all taxation save that upon land values.

It is remarkable that the Nation, in attempting to combat the "Henry George land theory," should ignore the theory and quote, as a statement of it, a paragraph from "Progress and Poverty" that has no place in the theory, and is only part of a reply to a minor objection. "The Henry George land theory," it says, "may be stated as follows: 'Historically, as ethically, private property in land is robbery. It nowhere springs from contract; it can nowhere be traced to perceptions of justice or expediency; it has everywhere had its birth in war and conquest, and in the selfish use which the cunning have made of superstition and law.' (Progress and Poverty, p. 333.)" This statement the Nation denies, insisting that private property in land, instead of being the result of force and fraud, has been gradually adopted as being the only way of securing the investment of capital for the sake of remote returns.

Whether Mr. George's historical generalization be true or not is of little importance to his land theory. Even if every title originated in honorable contract, the fact would remain that some tenants in common of this circling sphere take property from other tenants in common by force of contracts to which neither were parties; and that for this taking there is no other consideration than permission to use that to which by natural law each has an equal right—a similar consideration to what the big brother gives for half of his little brother's apple when he lets the little fellow slide on their father's cellar door. Mr. George might have left the historical consideration of land ownership out of his book without affecting either the soundness of his theory or the justice or

expediency of his remedy; and yet it is a paragraph from this chapter that the Nation selects as a vital point of attack.

But to say that the truth of Mr. George's historical generalization is immaterial is not to allow the Nation's denial. Mr. George's statement is made upon the authority of such men as Sir Henry Maine and Emile de Laveleye, on the honesty and skill of whose investigations we, who are not historians, must be pardoned for relying until the Nation cites authorities or acquires even a better reputation than it has for historical research and accuracy of statement. The Nation does refer to Professor Wagner of Berlin, whom it recommends because he "is called a socialist in many quarters," though why that should be a special recommendation is not exactly plain. But Professor Wagner fails to support the Nation's denial. He does not say that private property in land did not spring from force and fraud, but only that it has proved necessary for the sake of the community as a whole. To have proved necessary is very different from having been adopted as necessary; and that it has proved necessary, if that is what Professor Wagner said and meant to say, I must be bold enough to deny, though I am quite willing to concede that it has proved useful. It has given security to improvements which primitive forms of common ownership might not have given, and secured material advances which under those forms could not have been gained. But this security and these advances have been purchased at the price of more than enough income to have maintained the governments of the world on the highest plane of proper governmental expenditure; at the expense of great public debts which weigh down the industries of nations; at the expense of incalculable waste of productive power through the cornering of land; at the expense of involuntary poverty and its brood of social evils. The benefits of private ownership—security of tenure and improvements—could have been enjoyed at far less cost. It was only necessary to adapt the principle of common ownership to changed or changing conditions. It was only necessary to abandon the common use of land in consideration of its rent for common revenues.

The Nation wholly fails to make its denial good, if, indeed, it cannot be fairly said to abandon it when it says that distribution of land under private ownership is in many cases the result of force and fraud, but the system itself is not. After that it is hardly necessary either to refer to historical authority or to recall such commonly known facts as appropriation of tribal lands by tribal chiefs, apportionments of new countries by the cajolery and extermination of uncivilized peoples, or inclosure of commons as in England, and corrupt gifts to corporations as in this country. To say that the system did not originate in force or fraud, while admitting that the titles did, means, if it means anything in connection with the Nation's argument, that private ownership was adopted as a remedy for evils of common use, and that force and fraud were mere incidents. But force and fraud were not incidents, nor was the system adopted as a reform. It came out of a perennial struggle between land grabbers and the people. From chiefs whose tribal trusts became private titles, to feudal lords whose mere tenures have become absolute ownership, the system was built up by private encroachments upon common rights. The notion that it was made for the common good is an after thought, deriving plausibility from the fact that private possession, a mere incident of private ownership, has proved to be more beneficial than common use in promoting material advancement.

If private ownership was adopted as an expedient for the common good, why was it that only the powerful few became owners?

Not only does the Nation in this connection confuse the incidental with the essential, by attributing to ownership

what is due to possession, but it deceives or is itself deceived as to the remedy Mr. George proposes. Clearly and distinctly this remedy is common ownership; and yet the Nation inexclusively assumes it to be common use, and makes comparisons not between common ownership and private ownership but between common use and private ownership. It is impossible to read "Progress and Poverty" with any care without seeing that not only the author does not propose common use of valuable land, but that he distinctly condemns it.

Though the Nation's article consists chiefly in an attack upon Mr. George's reply to a minor objection, it states in addition three grounds of opposition to the extreme single tax idea: First, even if security for improvements could be realized under a system that took the whole of rent for public use, it is not quite true that there would be as great an incentive to improve as when there is a substantial right of private property to the land itself; second, the proposed security for improvements could not be made full or complete, in consequence of which any theoretical security for improvements would be practically insecure; and, third, the destruction of land titles would be a menace to property in other forms.

Why security for improvements would not be as great an incentive to improve as is ownership of the land, the Nation does not explain and nobody can guess. The reverse is true. We must go far to find land held under ground lease which is not improved, in process of improvement, or about to be improved; but we need not go far to find plenty of land held under private ownership, which is neither improved, nor in process of improvement, nor likely to be improved for a long time to come. More than that, we shall find very little land held on ground lease that is not improved to the best advantage; but the greater part of land held under private ownership is not improved to the best advantage. Whether instances be looked for on Broadway or in the suburbs, in agricultural regions or in mining districts, the fact is everywhere the same, that land held on ground lease is well improved, while a great proportion of land held under private ownership is relatively unimproved. The reason is on the surface. Lessees must make their profits out of improvements; therefore they improve. But owners may make profits out of the growth of population without improving; therefore, though more profit may be some incentive, they certainly have not the incentive of the man whose only hope of profit is in his improvements. As the ground lessee who pays his rent to one fellow citizen has every incentive to improve and none to let the land lie idle, so would he have if he paid his rent to all his fellow citizens, whether as rent or as land value tax. His incentive would be even greater, for now he improves under penalty of taxation—the better the improvement the higher the tax.

But, urges the Nation, the security for improvements could not be made full or complete. Perhaps not, if 100 per cent of the rent were taken for public use. But Mr. George has too much sense to suppose mathematical exactness possible, and the editor of the Nation ought to have too much sense to suppose it important. Mr. George no where proposes to take an exact 100 per cent of rent, but in chapter 3 of book 8 he does propose to leave to the nominal land owners something "more than is necessary to induce them to collect the public revenues." That is to say, referring to the Nation's objection, it is conceded that exactness is impossible, and lest in aiming at exactness we overstep the limits of rent and trench upon private property, we give the owner the benefit of a doubt by leaving him enough rent to make it quite sure that he pays no tax on his improvements. The supposed insecurity of tenure is purely imaginary. Every one's tenure would be secure so long as he paid his land tax. As to ordinary

land—city lots, farms, and so on—there could be no oppression or marked favoritism, for the values in a neighborhood are so nearly the same or have such a constant relation to each other, that fair appraisements are easily made and unfair appraisements could be easily detected. An increase of tax could not interfere with tenure, because there would be no increase of tax without an increase of rent out of which to pay it. But as to mines, docks, fisheries, quarries, oyster farms, and the like, the value of which is determined by peculiar conditions, taxation might not be the best way of appropriating rent. In such cases, however, leases to the highest bidder at reasonable intervals, on terms requiring a new lessee to buy the improvements of his predecessor, would meet the necessity and justice of the case.

The Nation's third, and what it calls its "deeper difficulty," must be quoted in full: "A sudden reversal of precedent, which takes away the security of property of one kind, reacts upon the security of property of every other kind. If people suddenly destroy land titles in obedience to the theories of Henry George, why will they not abolish other titles in obedience to the theories of Proudhon? If one form of property can be confiscated, the practical guarantees for the safety of other forms of property are greatly weakened. The insecurity thus created is a destructive force of tremendous moment."

This is a striking instance of the absurdity a misapplication of principle is capable of producing. I do not doubt that the destruction of title to property in any of its forms would be a menace to the right of property in all forms; and perhaps it is immaterial whether the property, title to which is destroyed, be something that is justly the subject of private ownership, provided it be so regarded. In such cases it is not a right of property questioned, but the right of property assailed—two entirely different things. For example, if slavery had been suddenly abolished, and the abolition had been accomplished, not as an act of justice but in full recognition of property rights in men, the act might have proved a destructive force, and the guarantees for the safety of other forms of property might have been weakened. But Henry George does not propose such a destruction of land titles. If it were done it would, as he says, "satisfy the law of justice" and meet all economic requirements. But he does not propose that it shall be done until it is done for the purpose of satisfying the law of justice; and to say that anything done to satisfy the law of justice, and which is really in accord with the law of justice, weakens the safety of any just property right, or is a destructive force, or assails justice in any of her relations, is absurd. That the destruction of land titles would really satisfy the law of justice is proved in "Progress and Poverty" by arguments that have never yet been answered though often replied to; and that Mr. George aims to have the people destroy them, not as an arbitrary act of power, but as an act of justice, is evident from all he has written.

The abolition of slavery took away security for property of one kind, but it did not weaken the guarantees for the safety of property of other kinds nor create a destructive force. If it be said that it was a war measure, the reply is that this is true of the emancipation proclamation, but not of abolition in Maryland, Delaware the District of Columbia, and localities excepted from the proclamation. The failure of the abolition of slavery to react upon other forms of property must have been due, therefore, either to the fact that the principle to which the Nation appeals is unsound, or that the principle did not work correctly in the only case of magnitude in recent times, or that slavery was abolished not as an assault upon property rights but as a measure of justice. It was probably due to the fact that it was abolished as a measure of justice and in the interest of property rights. So with the private ownership of land. The single tax doctrine, incul-

cating the idea of the sacredness of property, demands the shifting of taxation from what is justly private property to what is justly public property, and when it shall have done its perfect work the distinction in the public conscience between "thine" and "ours" will make clearer than ever the distinction between "thine" and "mine."

LOUIS F. POST.

ONE TAX ENOUGH.

(Second Article.)

Several correspondents have kindly called attention to an ambiguity in the definition of economic rent given in our first article. That definition would only apply to cases in which the *tenant* pays all such taxes as are imposed upon the value of the land. That is the rule in Great Britain and wherever ground rents prevail, but it is not the rule as to house-taenants in this country generally. The true definition seems to be as follows:

The economic rent of land consists of the clear net rent or profit of the landlord, *plus* all taxes levied directly upon the land.

But, as economic rent is usually computed upon an estimate of the market value of the land in fee simple, and as this value is based, in its turn, upon the assumption that the land, if bought at this price, will pay a net rent, clear of taxes, equal to the ordinary rate of interest, the rule is better stated, for practical purposes, in the following form:

The economic rental value of land is equal to the ordinary rate of interest upon the market value of its perpetual title, plus all taxes levied directly upon the land.

The rule, in this form, is one of universal application.

Another correspondent calls attention to our British statistics, pointing out some discrepancies between the figures which we gave and certain official returns. We were using, as far as possible, the figures of opponents of the single tax, without correction. These figures were erroneous; and so were some of those which we took from other sources. We will now proceed to state the correct figures, as well as they can be ascertained. Unfortunately, accuracy is impossible; but all errors are unfavorable to our side of the question; so that, if they could be corrected, the case for the single tax would be much stronger.

First, as to the revenue now required by the national and local governments of Great Britain and Ireland. The national expenses in 1885 were about £89,000,000 sterling; but these included all postal, telegraph and similar expenses; which paid for themselves and produced a profit. The amount required to be raised by taxation was only £73,900,000. So the receipts of the local authorities are stated at £67,344,000, but the real local *taxes* amounted to only £44,432,000. The total real taxes of Britain and Ireland, therefore, amounted in 1885 to less than £118,500,000 (Statesman's Year Book, 1888, p. 236).

Next, let us see what is the annual value of Britain and Irish land. We will take our statistics from the best possible authority, the twenty-eighth report of the commissioners of inland revenue. This report gives the following figures, except that we give round numbers, counting everything above £500 as £1,000, and everything below £500 as nothing. This makes statistics much easier to understand; and the results are practically quite as correct as if the usual interminable detail of figures were given.

For the sake of brevity, values in England, Scotland and Ireland will be called "British" values, although this is not strictly correct.

British Pure Land Values, 1884.

Lands, returned as such,..... £65,412,000
Manors, tithes, fines, etc.,..... 85,000
Fishing and shooting rights,..... 573,000
Market and tolls,..... 607,000

£67,374,000

British Mixed Land Values, 1884.

Houses and lots,..... £127,050,000
Canals, water works, mines, gas, etc.,..... 23,381,000
Railways,..... 33,050,000

£183,481,000

On half of these values, as land,..... 91,211,000
Total land values,..... £183,715,000

These, however, are *net* values, that is, they represent the net annual income derived from British land, after all taxes assessed upon the land, but collected from the tenant, have been deducted from the economic rent.

The same valuable report shows what these taxes are. The tenant pays all the "inhabited house duty," all local rates (except a part, in Ireland), and, in England only, all the income tax on real estate, except on houses renting for less than £10 per annum.

The net house duty amounted to £1,855,000.

The income tax collected through occupiers in England, amounted to an average rate of 6d. on the pound, or 2 1/2 per cent on £144,189,000, or £3,604,725. There is no reason for making any allowance for the small proportion of cases in which the landlord is himself the occupier; because his land is assessed only at the rate at which he could let it to a tenant who would have to pay the tax.

The land tax amounted to £1,045,000.

The local rates amounted to £37,846,000; of which, we will assume that £846,000 was paid by landlords of very small tenements in Ireland, who are made directly responsible for rates. This will leave, as paid by tenants, about £37,000,000. Tithes, said to amount to £4,054,000, are left out of account; because, while they are generally paid by the tenant, they must be added to the taxes, if reckoned at all; and so they would be added to both sides of the account. I have, moreover, no official information as to their amount or the mode in which they are collected.

We are now prepared to calculate the amount to be added to the net rent of land, on these various accounts, in order to determine the economic rent. The whole of the land tax, half the house duty, and the same proportion of income tax and local rates as the value of land has already been shown to bear to the value of all real estate (that is, 158 parts in 250, say 63 per cent), are direct taxes upon the land. Whatever is paid by tenants, therefore, must be apportioned between land and improvements, upon this basis.

British Land Taxes, deducted in estimate of Rent.

	Gross	Proportion Deducted
House duty.....	£1,855,000	50 p.c. £927,500
Income tax.....	3,604,725	63 p.c. 2,359,000
Land tax.....	1,045,000	all 1,045,000
Local rates.....	37,000,000	63 p.c. 23,310,000
Total.....	£43,500,000	£27,550,500

If these figures are correct (and great pains have been taken to make them so) it would seem that the annual rental value of British land is as follows:

Net rental value..... £158,715,000
Direct taxes to be added..... 27,550,500
Gross rental value..... £183,265,500 or \$83,6386,000

Present taxes, national and provincial..... 118,500,000 \$55,725,000

Surplus left to land owners under the single tax..... £67,765,000 or \$32,861,00

I confess that this result startled me, and seemed at first incredible. But while I invite criticism, and do not present this statement as final, I can at present see no miscalculation in it, except one. The "lands," returned in the assessment for income tax, are mostly improved lands, though not including residences or stores of any kind. Under the single tax system, these lands could be assessed only at their value, irrespective of improvements. This deduction would, it may be presumed, reduce the value of cultivated lands by about one-third. The utmost allowance which could be made on this ground, however, would be £20,000,000 on the net rents and about one-eighth of the proportion of income tax and local rates charged in the above table, or £3,200,000, making £23,200,000 in all. On the other hand, overwhelming proofs have been furnished, in many investigations of the subject, that the income tax assessment grossly underestimates the value of both land and houses. Unoccupied real estate is not assessed at all; and the costly mansions and private parks and pleasure grounds of the wealthy classes are assessed at ridiculously low rates. It is impossible to tell precisely what should be added upon these grounds; but it is also impossible to justify an estimate of less than £20,000,-

000 upon the facts, so far as they appear. The one error, therefore, corrects the other. There is no good reason to doubt that the rent of the bare land of Great Britain and Ireland is sufficient to defray all the expenses of government, while leaving the land owners in possession of a net rent of £60,000,000 to £70,000,000 per annum.

Having examined into the effect of the single tax in Boston and in Great Britain, it may be interesting to test the question by reference to the statistics of Connecticut, which will be taken mainly from the report of special commissioners to the legislature in 1887, supplemented by reference to the census of 1880, where this report does not give the necessary information.

From these authorities it appears that, at the latest dates concerning which information is accessible, farming lands were assessed at about \$60,000,000, and town lands at \$191,000,000, all improvements included, while the value of railroads lying within the state was assessed at the current market price, at over \$62,000,000. The report of the tax commissioners shows conclusively that real estate, both in town and country, was immensely undervalued, and that, at the very lowest, fifty per cent ought to be added to the assessment in order to approximate the actual market value of this property.

Adding fifty per cent to town and farm values, and taking railroads at their assessed valuation, we arrive at the following valuation of real estate in Connecticut:

Farm values.....	\$90,000,000
Town values.....	26,000,000
Railroad values.....	62,000,000
	\$138,000,000

This valuation is unquestionably far too low, and \$500,000,000 would probably be none too much. It is not necessary, however, to make any speculative corrections; but the above very moderate figures may be accepted as the basis of calculation. One-half of this amount, or \$219,000,000, will be an extremely and unreasonably low estimate of the market value of bare land in Connecticut.

The amount of taxation in Connecticut for state and local purposes, according to the latest accessible returns, was \$6,600,000 per annum; and the average rate of local taxation for the whole state was somewhat over 1 1/2 per cent. The bare land of Connecticut, exclusive of railroads, is now assessed at about \$156,000,000, on which amount there is a present taxation at the average rate of 1 1/2 per cent. Railroad lands are now practically assessed at about \$30,000,000, on which there is a tax of exactly one per cent. Connecticut's proportion of the federal taxes, if they were levied directly, would be about \$4,000,000.

It may be taken as certain that Connecticut land is worth to its owners a net rent of at least five per cent per annum upon its market value, clear of all taxes, because that is the lowest rate at which money can be borrowed on ordinary mortgage loans in Connecticut. As in other cases, the taxes which are now levied upon the bare land must be added to the present net rent of five per cent upon the market value, in order to ascertain the gross rent which furnishes the true basis for taxation.

The result of a calculation, made upon the basis of the foregoing figures, is as follows:

True land values \$219,000,000 bearing net rent of 5 per cent.....	\$10,950,000
Present land tax on assessment of \$138,000,000 at 1 1/2 per cent.....	2,070,000
Diff'ren' railroad lands \$30,000,000 at 1 per cent.....	300,000
	\$13,320,000
True gross rent of Connecticut.....	\$11,175,000
Present gross taxes.....	10,600,000
Surplus remaining to land owners, after paying all existing taxes.....	\$8,575,000

But this does not represent the whole surplus which would really remain to land owners under the single tax, if limited to the actual needs of government. For the federal government now collects an enormous revenue, which is utterly unnecessary for any legitimate purposes. If direct taxation were adopted this unnecessary taxation would instantly cease, and the proportion of federal taxes falling upon Connecticut

would be reduced about \$1,000,000 per annum. This would increase the surplus of economic rent over taxation to \$4,575,000, showing that a trifle over two-thirds of the rent would cover all the cost of government, national and local.

Even yet we have not stated the case fully in favor of the single tax. Every owner of land owns also a large amount of buildings and personal property. Theoretically, in Connecticut, these are taxed at precisely the same rate as his land; but we have seen that, in Boston, buildings are assessed at seventy per cent of the land upon which they are placed. Buildings necessarily belong to land owners exclusively; and all the benefits accruing from the exemption of buildings from taxation will accrue to land owners only, in the first instance. It is true that they shift these taxes, for the most part, over to their tenants, if they have any; but where, as in Connecticut, is very largely the case, the land owner is himself the occupier, he must bear the burden of these taxes. We have seen further that, in Boston, personal property is assessed at sixty per cent of the land values. Land owners own at least their full share of personal property. The abolition of taxes on all improvements and personal property would, therefore, relieve a large majority of land owners (in number, of course, not in value) from a greater burden than would fall upon them by reason of their ownership of land.

Add to this their relief from all indirect taxation, under tariffs, excise laws, etc., and the land owning class in Connecticut would really not fare badly under the single tax.

All these calculations have been made without any preconceived theory as to the proportion which taxation would probably bear to rent, and without any anticipation that in places so widely separated and so unlike in their social conditions, as Boston, Connecticut and Great Britain, there would be any similarity in results. Yet there is a very remarkable approach to uniformity in them. Including railway values in each, as has been done, in the final estimates, the results are as follows:

	Gross Rent.	Taxes.	Percentage.
Boston.....	\$24,000,000	\$16,000,000	66 2/3
Connecticut.....	14,175,000	9,400,000	67 3/4
Great Britain.....	203,000,000	57,500,000	63 2/3

Everything seems to point to the conclusion that the cost of government is less than two-thirds of ground rent.

THOMAS G. SHEARMAN.

WELCOMED BY THE RADICAL CLUB.

Prominent Leaders of the English Movement Give Dinner to Henry George.

LONDON, March 22.—On Saturday night last the members of the Radical club entertained Mr. Henry George at dinner at the Covent Garden hotel, to celebrate his arrival in this country on a lecturing tour through England, Wales and Scotland. The company numbered about one hundred and fifty. Dr. Gutteridge, the president of the club, presided, and the guest of the evening sat at his right hand. Among those supporting them were Dr. Clark, M. P. (Caithnesshire); Mr. W. R. Cremer, M. P. (Shoreditch); Mr. W. M. Thompson (liberal candidate for Deptford); Mr. B. T. L. Thompson (liberal candidate for Stepney); Mr. R. Stapley (liberal candidate for Brixton); the Hon. Dadabhai Naoroji; Mr. R. B. Kimball (New York); Professor T. H. McChesney (Chicago); the Rev. Stewart Headlam (editor of the Church Reformer); Mr. Croxden Powell (editor of the Liberal and Radical); Dr. Pankhurst of Manchester, Professor Rhys Davids, Dillon Lewis, S. M. Burroughs, R. Wherry Anderson, W. Mitchell, W. T. Raymond, R. Eve, H. Williams, Stewart Wallace and many prominent members of the radical clubs of Brixton, Lewisham, Finsbury and other metropolitan divisions.

The Radical club has been in existence about a year, and its members are principally composed of the more aggressive and younger members of the National liberal club. In its political work it stands about half way between the National liberal and the Eighty clubs, and its intention is to devote its exertions principally to the furtherance of advanced views both in municipal and political affairs in London.

The dinner was capably served and upon the removal of the cloth the chairman proposed "The Queen and the President of the United States." He referred in his remarks to the great victory the liberals had gained on the previous day at a bye election at Kennington. If, he remarked, the radicals' faces were long on that day there was no longer any cause for that elongation. The victory at Kennington was a happy augury for the new campaign of the great apostle of the

land whom they were present to welcome. They were met to receive one whose name was known in both hemispheres and respected and honored in both countries. Since he was an American he was just as much one of them as though he was one of their fellow countrymen; for they were all one in origin, in language and in destiny. The toast was cordially responded to.

Mr. Anderson, political secretary of the club, announced that letters expressing regret for inability to attend had been received from many persons, among whom were Mr. Conybeare, M. P., Mr. Hunter, M. P., Mr. W. Saunders and the Rev. Stopford Brooke.

The health of Mr. Henry George was proposed by Dr. Clark, who, in doing so, said their guest was propagating an old doctrine that had been almost forgotten—that was Locke's theory of the basis of property which gave them a real theory for property against which the waves of some forms of socialism would beat in vain. Henry George was, he continued, one of the most powerful conservative forces of the Anglo-Saxon race, for his doctrine was that whatever a human being could produce, that human being had a right to enjoy. So far from being a teacher of the gospel of theft, as he had been represented, their guest was a teacher who would prevent theft. They all knew him as a deep thinker, an eloquent speaker and a brilliant writer. To re-establish the theory of John Locke in the minds of men was his mission, and in that capacity he had been well called the Prophet of San Francisco. He was a prophet who would bring glad tidings to all the earth.

On rising to respond, Mr. George was received with round upon round of cheering. After thanking them for the greeting, he said:

"I thank my friend Dr. Clark for calling me a conservative. I am a conservative because I am a radical. There are no more dangerous people at the present time than those who meddle with social questions without having the courage to go to the root. I am glad to be greeted here by this club, and I am glad of its existence. I think you have done wisely and well in starting it. The tail has long been wagging the dog in this country, as on the other side of the Atlantic, and it is time now that the dog should do something to wag the tail. (Laughter, and 'Hear, hear.') I believe that the concentration of radical effort will do much to bring forward clear principles in your politics, and by doing much in your politics will do much in ours, for the countries are closely united in blood, in tradition, and literature, and we are one in thought. (Cheers.) We are looking to you now for a great step to the front, and it will not be long before the response will come from our side of the Atlantic. Radicalism, the going to the root of things, gives, to my mind, the only conservative and the only peaceful solution of the great questions that are now pressing upon our civilization. As Tolstoi has said, we have many men who are willing to do anything possible to help the working classes, to relieve the poor, and to raise up the down-trodden, except getting off their backs. (Laughter.) What to-day radicalism ought to mean—and I think will soon fully mean—is that the men who have so long been quietly sitting upon the shoulders of their fellows shall be asked to step down."

Dr. Pankhurst of Manchester proposed "Success to the Henry George campaign" in a speech in which he dwelt upon the necessity that the radicals should push on the liberal leaders. This was responded to by Mr. S. M. Burroughs, who eulogized the single tax as the great and peaceful remedy for social difficulties, and also by Mr. D. Lewis, one of the campaign committee, who in doing so summarized the theory of the single tax, the tax on the value of bare land which would, he said, let loose millions of acres for cultivation and building, and would resuscitate industries and solve the question of the unemployed. "The Visitors" were proposed by Mr. R. Eve, and Messrs. B. T. Thompson, Stewart Wallace and H. Williams responded, and made speeches which showed them in accord with the principles of the guest of the evening.

RADICAL.

LONDON.—The Star, Christian Commonwealth and other papers are strongly advocating the tax on land values. All the leading liberals are now committed to it, and also many tories. The Standard, a tory paper, and seven-eighths of the county council advocate it, and it is only a question of time when the idea will be acted upon, and England, free from the repressive influence of unjust taxation, will enter upon an epoch of prosperity such as has hardly been dreamed of by the most sanguine reformers.

S. M. BURROUGHS.

Protecting American Industries.

New York Tribune, March 25.—Notices were issued at the Clark Thread works yesterday of a reduction in the wages of the spinners from \$5.18 per 100 pounds to \$4.40, a difference of about 15 per cent.

Auxiliaries for Each Other's Welfare.

Christian Commonwealth,

SCENE.—Distribution of prizes at National school in England. Sir Olley Stockupper—There, my lad, is the prize you have won so well; and—er—and my earnest wish—er—is that you may go on—er—and become a hard-working man and—er—an upright and honest member of society. Tommy—Thanky, sir, an' I wishes the same to you, sir!

WHAT THE NEWSPAPERS SAY.

"The effect of levying all taxation upon land values would be that no man could afford to hold more land than he could use, and it would cease to be profitable to hold it merely for purposes of speculation, and everybody would have a better chance to acquire enough land for his own uses."—[San Francisco Star.]

Many persons, not paying particular attention to the matter, are under the impression that the single tax movement, led by Henry George and his disciples, has quietly subsided, no more to disturb the even tenor of our way. This is by no means the case.—[Binghamton Leader.]

The more Henry George's theory of levying all taxes upon ground values is understood, the more attention it is attracting. The day is coming in this country when the holding of vast tracts of land for speculative purposes will have to be regulated, and perhaps the proper way to get at it is to levy all taxes upon land values.—[Kalamazoo, Mich., Gazette.]

In the early days of the republic strikes were unknown. Why are they so common now? Simply because of the competition of laborers for employment; and this competition is the necessary result of land monopoly.—[San Francisco Star.]

The single tax ideas of Henry George are fast taking firm hold in the minds of those who live and toil in England, Ireland and Scotland.—[Milwaukee Review.]

Failure of the Fall River Strike.

The fate of the Fall River weavers suggests that it is as foolish to put your trust in politicians as in princes. Some time workmen will learn that a tax avowedly imposed to enable capitalists to reap big profits in spite of high wages, does not tend to increase wages. It was certainly not intended to increase them.—[Eagle Pass, Texas, Guide.]

The mill owners at Fall River have "starved out" the strike of their ill-paid operatives. So secure were they in their position behind the bulwark of the tariff made for their benefit, that the price of their stock scarcely wavered from its high premium, and their fat dividends will show no shrinkage. The operatives will now go back to producing fifty per cent more cloth than the English workmen at no better pay. And they will begin to think where the "protection" comes in.—[New York World.]

Behold the dividends which these Fall River employes have earned for these rich corporations this very last year: American, 22 1/2 per cent; Border City, 11; Fall River, 12; Flint, 10; Granite, 22; Sagamore, 13; Bourne, 16; Seacombe, 14 1/2; Wampanoag, 11 1/2; Troy, 20; Union, 40.—[Portland, Me., Eastern Argus.]

The cotton weavers of Fall River took the corporations at their word, and asked for a restoration of the wages of 1884, which they were then told must be reduced because a democratic administration was coming into power, and they have been refused, although during the past four years their employers made greater profits than ever before. They should have asked for the increase of pay before the presidential election.—[Paterson Guardian.]

Pretty Cool to Come From a Champion of Protection to the American Workingman.

New York Tribune.

The strike in Fall River has collapsed after lasting a trifle over a fortnight. It was begun with the purpose of forcing an advance of wages, and some six thousand weavers joined in it, practically closing all the mills in the city. The employers refused to yield, claiming that they could not afford to raise wages. The workmen, having used up all their surplus funds, have been forced to go to work again after throwing away more than half a month's earnings. But it is far wiser for them to give up a hopeless struggle now than six months hence.

It is to be Hoped They Will Not Forget.

Paterson Guardian.

"Wages must come down," is the head line under which a Pittsburg republican organ announces the reduction of their employes' pay by these great Pennsylvania iron companies. That is not exactly the treat promised to workmen when they were asked to vote for Harrison and Morton last fall, but they are expected to forget this little discrepancy before the next election.

More Protection.

Buffalo News.

A general shut down of the Monongahela mines is feared, and it is threatened that unless the miners accept a reduction all the works will be closed, and 5,000 miners will be thrown out of work.

The Idea is Spreading Everywhere.

Binghamton Leader.

Mr. George is now in England, where he nightly addresses large meetings of eager listeners, among whom, it appears, is a fair representation of prominent persons. Clergymen especially seem to have become interested, many of them cordially granting him the use of their pulpits on Sundays as well as upon other days of the week. Many believers are of the opinion that England is more ripe than is this country for an acceptance of the land value tax theory. Whether that be so or not, and whether we like it or not, it can not be denied that the idea is spreading here as there. Its final acceptance or rejection ought to depend, and doubtless will depend, upon its merits or demerits, and these must come to be recognized through candid and thorough examination and discussion, which its advocates demand, and which those who believe its fallacies glaring and easily proven should have no need to fear.

IN NEW SOUTH WALES.

The Work That Has Been Done There in Behalf of the Single Tax.

The first annual report of the Sydney branch of the Land nationalization league of New South Wales, Australia, issued six weeks ago, gives a brief account of the progress of the movement in that colony since its first beginnings. It says that five years after the appearance of "Progress and Poverty" in America it was republished in Sydney in the columns of the Daily Telegraph, but it was not until February, 1887, that the first land nationalization league in the colony was established at Forbes. The president was Frank Cotton, and the platform which he drew up stated the principal object to be "to abolish all existing methods of raising revenue, and to substitute a single tax on land values alone." Thus the term "single tax" was current in Australia at an early day. By the end of the year 1887 there were seven leagues, with a total membership of 1,000, backed by twenty-five newspapers devoted to the cause. In January, 1888, a branch was formed at the metropolis, Sydney. Mr. Traill, a brilliant writer of the Bulletin, a well-known and very prosperous illustrated weekly paper, was made president, E. W. Foxall and J. A. Dobbie, vice presidents, and W. H. Waddington, secretary. "The most energetic member of the branch," says the report, "was undoubtedly E. W. Foxall, who devoted a fortnight's holiday to lecturing through the country on behalf of land nationalization, giving the league a tremendous impetus in the different centers through which he passed." Some months after this, arrangements were made with John Farrell, editor of the Lithgow Land Nationalizer, as a result of which he will shortly be the editor of a paper in Sydney, where an organ is very much needed.

A paid secretary was hired near the close of last year, and through his efforts and those of the different members a hot discussion in the newspapers of Sydney has been carried on. About this time two well known free trade members of parliament, B. R. Wise and C. L. Garland, came out squarely for the land tax, Mr. Garland being made president of the Sydney league. This hastened the inevitable conflict between the single tax free traders and the land nationalization protectionists. Frank Cotton, the lecturer to the leagues, challenged a leading protectionist to a public debate, but at the last moment Mr. Cotton himself was unable to appear, and Mr. Foxall on two days' notice took the free trade side. In the meantime the protectionists, in parliament had come out squarely against the land tax. Nevertheless, the land nationalization movement was so strong that the "Protection and political reform league" made a bold bid for their co-operation, and passed a resolution to the effect that "this league refuses to aid any public discussion which tends to interfere with protectionists being also land nationalizationists." This created a great deal of amusement, as it was well known that the leaders of the protection party derided the idea of land nationalization. The organ of the protectionists, the Australian Star, which at first had been friendly to the land tax men, at last found itself compelled to change front, and began to deliberately attack and misrepresent their principles. Thus in Australia as in America the opponents of freedom are being drawn up on one side and the advocates of freedom on the other. Protection and the single tax contradict each other there as here.

At the close of the year a circular was sent out asking the opinion of the eighteen leagues in the colony as to the advisability of changing the name from "land nationalization" to "single tax," and the holding of a conference and the affiliation of all the leagues with a central council. All the replies so far have favored these three propositions. The dissolution of parliament that occurred in the beginning of the year gave several single tax men the opportunity of contesting the seats in various localities. The result of the election is given in the letter from Percy R. Meggy, secretary of the Sydney land nationalization league, which appears in this issue of THE STANDARD.

The prospects for the future, the report says in closing, are brighter than ever before.

About the Recent Election.

SYDNEY, Feb. 18.—We have just concluded a most exciting election in this colony on a distinct fiscal issue. The result as declared this morning is that the free traders—or rather the revenue tariffists—have been returned with a majority of five out of a total of 137. This is the very best thing that could possibly have happened, since in order to carry on the government the free traders will have to come right over to us, and advocate complete as opposed to partial free trade. Several members have been returned to the new parliament who are known to be in favor of the single tax, although the land nationalization candidate—Frank Cotton—was beaten, as also was a member of our committee who ran for Wellombi, after leaving the glebe, while a second member of the committee, finding the cause hopeless at Albury, retired. The chances are that the protectionists, who managed by a fluke to get hold of the reins of government for a few weeks, will be ousted as soon as parliament meets, and that the policy of obstruction which they are sure to initiate will necessitate

another dissolution. In the meantime the people are beginning to be educated on this great question, an intense interest is felt in it, and letters on the subject in the various papers are eagerly read. It is a rather significant fact that while there was a preponderance of 100,000 votes in favor of free trade in your campaign, there has been a preponderance here of two-thirds in favor of the same—viz: 140,000 as against 70,000—counting the votes cast for members actually returned, so that the victory was really far greater than appears to be the case.

One of the long promised measures which must soon be brought forward by whichever party comes ultimately into power—and that will not be the party for restricting trade—is the local government bill. We are the only colony that has no such bill. Hitherto municipal rates have been collected, as everywhere else, on land and various forms of wealth, especially on various forms of wealth. We will agitate, have already agitated, for the insertion of a clause placing taxation on land and various forms of wealth—especially land! There is a strong feeling already throughout the country in favor of such a change.

I may tell you that Henry George is held in the greatest reverence and affection throughout these colonies. It is surprising to learn how deep and widespread the feeling is. His books are eagerly read, and his ideas are permeating the whole land. Right out in the bush, in the byways of civilization, remote from the haunts of man, where the squatter wages ceaseless war against rabbits, heat and draught—even there may frequently be heard discussed the theories of Henry George.

PERCY R. MEGGY,

Sec. Sydney Land Nationalization League.

[As has been learned by cable and stated in THE STANDARD, the protectionist government has been succeeded by a free trade government, as the correspondent predicted, with Sir Henry Parkes at its head. No news has been received of a dissolution.—ED. STANDARD.

Greeting From the Antipodes.

PARKES, N. S. W., Jan. 31.—We, the single tax men of this part of New South Wales, greet all of our brethren of America who are doing such wonderful work in the cause of humanity. We watch with intense interest your victories. We here in Australia are growing in strength every day in the cause of right against vested wrong. One thing is wanted to start us along to greater victories and that is Henry George's presence among us, which we of Australia crave for.

JOHN DODD.

A Straw That Shows the Wind in New South Wales.

Lithgow, New South Wales, Mercury.

John Farrell, who has been editing the Nationalizer here for the past eighteen months, left Lithgow on last Saturday. Mr. Farrell has gone to Sydney, where he will take charge of the new organ of the single tax movement. The paper is certain to be one of the best journalistic productions in New South Wales, as it will have a host of able contributors from all the colonies besides its gifted editor, who is himself equal to a literary host. As a writer Mr. Farrell has few superiors in Australia, and we wish him and the cause he so brilliantly champions every success. The future belongs to the single tax party, which is to-day, though numerically weak, intellectually stronger than any other political organization. The truths taught by this party are rapidly dawning on the minds of the most intelligent Australians, and in a very short time there will be such an uprising as will astonish the political fossils who preach the old party platitudes, and tell workingmen that their grievances can be removed by a little tariff tinkering.

THE UNIONS IN ADVANCE OF THE STATE

The Nebraska Senate Votes Down the Australian Ballot Bill and the Omaha Typographical Union Demonstrates the Success of the Method.

OMAHA, Neb.—The Australian ballot bill has finally been defeated in the senate by a vote of 19 to 12. Notwithstanding this unfortunate result, we are very well satisfied with our fight. The agitation was not begun until after election, was confined to Omaha, and was pushed solely by a few single tax men who had very little money to spend. No petitions were circulated, but all the Omaha labor organizations officially requested the adoption of the bill. It passed the house by the decisive vote of 63 to 18, but was defeated in the senate after all but two or three of the senators had pledged themselves to vote for it. We expect to carry the measure in the next legislature. The labor organizations will pledge the legislative candidates before election, the next time. Especial credit for the great measure of success we obtained in carrying the bill through the house is due to Messrs. Charles Abernethy and John C. Thompson, who have made this fight their winter's work.

On Wednesday, the 27th, Omaha Typographical union, No. 190, elected its officers for the ensuing year by the Australian system. All necessary details of the system were observed, and its marked success delighted the printers. Between 12 m. and 7:30 p. m. 257 votes were polled, and double the number could have been polled without difficulty. Six booths were erected. All of the city papers gave extended accounts of this test election, and stated that it proved conclusively the practicability of the Australian system.

JOHN E. EMBLEM.

THE SINGLE TAX PETITION TO CONGRESS.

SINGLE TAX ENROLLMENT COMMITTEE, |
NEW YORK, April 2.

The work on the petition goes steadily forward without any notable change. In some communities our friends think they have obtained nearly all the signatures possible, but the falling off in one place is generally compensated by renewed activity elsewhere. From all parts of the country enthusiastic endorsements of the work continue to come in, but this has already been made so clear that it does not seem worth while to load the columns of THE STANDARD with repetitions of a sentiment so general.

The number of enrolled names now exceeds 45,000, and there seems every probability that by the time 50,000 is reached the momentum given by such a number will stimulate renewed work. The record now stands as follows:

Reported last week 42,393
Received during week ending April 2, 2,637

Total 45,030

The contributions for carrying on the work have amounted during the week to \$161.51, of which \$100 was from regular subscribers, leaving \$61.51 received from the public. As was explained last week, there was then a failure on the part of the popular subscriptions to cover the actual cost of sending out tracts amounting to \$452.93. Deducting the popular subscriptions this week from this amount brings it down to \$391.43. The committee, however, though compelled to exercise the utmost economy in the distribution of literature until this deficit is wiped out, has nevertheless been compelled to order some additional literature, as there are some thousands of wrappers now written awaiting tracts. If our friends would but make a special effort to wipe out this diminishing deficit, the committee would be able to keep more closely up to its work in sending out literature. The contributions during the week have been as follows:

J. L. Shoemaker, Philadelphia, Pa.	1 00
Henry Cashin, Kansas City, Mo.	50
F. S. Briggs, New Hampton, Iowa.	3 00
F. Boardman, Bennett, Pa.	1 00
William D. Quigley, Kenosha, Wis.	1 00
Thos. J. Skidmore, Seneca Falls, N. Y.	25
R. S. Gauquing, Seneca Falls, N. Y.	75
J. A. Hamm, Wymore, Neb.	50
S. Byron Welcome, Los Angeles, Cal.	3 00
W. & M. Mendelson, New York city.	25 00
George N. Numsen, Baltimore, Md.	5 00
John Cairns, Hartford, Conn.	25
Daniel Boone, Assembly K. of L., Newport, Ky.	2 50
Cigar Maker's Union 129, Denver, Col.	1 25
John Dunn, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1 00
George Champion, Denver, Col.	2 00
Emil L. Nilson, New York city	1 00
S. Mendelson, New York city	75 00
John Bridge, Detroit, Mich.	2 00
John C. Gibbs, New Orleans, La.	2 50
"F. M." New York city	25 00
James F. Mullon, Omaha, Neb.	1 00
O. C. Stewart, Cookport, Pa.	1 00
Geo. V. Wells, Chicago, Ill.	50
Cornelius Martin, Cincinnati, Ohio	1 00
"S. T." Albany, N. Y.	3 00
Sundry subscriptions in postage stamps	1 51

\$161.51

Previously acknowledged in THE STANDARD. 3,375 34

Total \$3,536 85

For a time, for the sake of saving space in THE STANDARD and avoiding cost of postage, contributions in postage stamps were not acknowledged in detail, but as this did not seem quite fair the committee determined to make acknowledgement of all contributions of twenty-five cents or over, whether received in money or stamps, and to acknowledge in the general item of stamps all contributions under twenty-five cents. It will be seen clearly that some such rule is necessary, because of the hundreds of letters received may contain a single two cent stamp, and others two or three stamps and so on. If each one were separately acknowledged it would string out needlessly in THE STANDARD and use up a large part of the postage in mailing receipts. These stamp contributions, however, are exceedingly important, for, small as they seem, they have very nearly paid the letter postage of our whole correspondence for some months. Of course they do not pay the postage on large quantities of documents sent out, for which stamps are bought by the thousand, hence, though it is impracticable to acknowledge them separately, the contributions are highly appreciated.

W. M. T. CROASDALE, Chairman.

THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB.

A Battle Royal in Which a Single Tax Man Carries Off the Honors.

The rooms of the Manhattan single tax club were more than usually crowded last Sunday evening, when Mr. Antonio M. Molina delivered his address on "The single tax versus individualism and socialism." A number of socialists were present anxious to break a lance with the lecturer, Professor DeLeon among them. Mr. Molina put into concise form the doctrine of each of these schools, and said that they could be classed as 1, the German (state socialism) which wanted the state to take control of the land and all the materials and machinery of production; 2, the French (individualistic), which wanted government to exist only for

the purpose of protecting the individual from force and fraud; and 3, the American (single tax), which wanted the state to guarantee to each individual equal rights with every other individual, the special means being to give all equal access to land by taxing holdings to their full rental value. Then Mr. Molina proceeded to show where, in his opinion, the errors were in the French and German schools, and he devoted himself particularly to the last. The socialists, he said, laid all the evils under which the people suffer to the competition resulting from the present wages system. Mr. Molina disputed this, and demonstrated mathematically, on a blackboard, that wages always depended on the margin of cultivation.

The socialists, headed by Professor De Leon, did not take the facts stated by Mr. Molina in the spirit in which they had been offered, but even went so far as to indulge in word-jugglery in order to disprove the arguments advanced by the lecturer. This seemed to wake Mr. Molina up, for in his closing remarks it would hardly be too much to say that he smashed the arguments of his socialist opponents into flinders, and then ground them to powder. Taken altogether, it was a most interesting evening.

The address next Sunday evening will be delivered by R. R. Bowker of the Reform club, on "Practical politics and party organization."

On Friday evening last the club treated its friends to a stereoptican entertainment, giving views of the Yosemite valley, California, Niagara falls, portraits of men whose names have gone into history, and concluding with a comic series. A pleasant evening was had.

Clubs and Meetings.

CANTON, Maryland.—William J. Ogden of Charlotte, North Carolina, lectured here last week on "How to raise wages." The lecture was under the auspices of the Single tax league of Maryland. Mr. Ogden held that the only way to permanently raise wages was by the adoption of the single tax upon land values, thus giving labor and capital the part of production now unjustly taken by land owners. The lecturer answered all questions by the audience.

ENGLEWOOD, Ill.—It will perhaps interest single tax men to learn that the Social science club of Englewood, Ill., including some fifty of the more enlightened and liberal minded citizens (of both sexes), have just finished the study of "Social Problems" and are about to begin the study of "Progress and Poverty." Most of those who have followed the study closely from the beginning seem to be pretty thoroughly convinced of the correctness of the single tax theory, although fully opposed to it at first.

O. M. PETERSON.

JERSEY CITY, N. J.—The single tax men here held a public meeting at Cooper's hall on last Thursday evening. John Moley employed the society notes of a late issue of THE STANDARD as a text for a comparison between the lot of the poor and the rich. Joseph Dana Miller, the lecturer of the evening, spoke for an hour on the moral aspects of the single tax doctrine.

J. T.

HENRY GEORGE'S MOVEMENTS.

NEW YORK STAR.

LONDON, March 31.—Henry George has been addressing immense audiences in Wales during the week, and has everywhere met with an enthusiastic reception. He will speak in London again this week, beginning in Westminster chapel on Monday.

NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, April 1.—Arrangements have been made for a public debate in London some time in May between Mr. Henry George and Mr. Samuel Smith, a member of parliament. Mr. Smith has published a number of essays on political and economical subjects.

THOMAS G. SHEARMAN TO ADDRESS CHURCH MEMBERS.

ANNOUNCEMENT is made in the programme of the spring meeting of the New York and Brooklyn association of Congregational churches, which takes place at Tremont (New York city) on Tuesday, April 9, that Thomas G. Shearman will on that occasion introduce a discussion on "The Christian Law in Economic Questions."

THE INTIMATION IS NOT SO VERY UNFAIR.

NEW YORK PRESS, March 30, 1889.

The intimation that the Press in advocating protection has ever held out the idea that it was a cure for idleness is unfair. We realize keenly that in a country so vast and with a constantly increasing influx of workers from abroad the number of unemployed is great.

NEW YORK PRESS, November 9, 1888.

Boom! boom! business boom!

Listen to the rattle of the spindle and the loom!

Listen to the music when the wheels go round! Freeing raw material from prisons in the ground,

Making each American wilderness to bloom.

Business, business, business boom.

THEM HE WILL BE DUE IN FOUR YEARS.

AKRON, Ohio, Times.

President Cleveland was a man ahead of the times. About four years ahead. He knew that the tariff is a tax and an unjust and unnecessary tax at that. The country will be fully convinced of this fact before President Harrison is relegated to the rear four years hence.

THE REFORM CLUB.

The Active Work of the Committee on Tariff Reform—Helping to Start Similar Clubs in Other Parts of the Country.

Perhaps no better disproof is offered of the protectionists' statement that the recent election has settled the tariff question than the work which is now going on in the tariff reform organizations all over the country. This work, hitherto confined to localities, is becoming better and better organized; clubs are joining leagues, and independent organizations are beginning to co-operate with each other. In this movement toward more systematic and homogeneous plan of work, the Reform club of this city is taking a very active part. This club, as the constitution reads, "has for its immediate purpose effective agitation in favor of tariff reform by reduction or abrogation of so-called protective taxes." Its most important committee is therefore the committee on tariff reform, of which John De Witt Warner is chairman and S. S. Terry secretary. This committee is divided into sub-committees as follows: On New York city, Chairman E. Ellery Anderson; on New York state, Chairman Jason Hinman; on other states, Chairman H. De F. Baldwin; on the press, Chairman W. H. Page; on industrial statistics, Chairman Calvin Tomkins, and on congress, Chairman John De Witt Warner.

A reporter for THE STANDARD called on Mr. Warner for the purpose of learning what the actual work of these committees consisted of. In reply to questions Mr. Warner said:

"I can best explain the plan of work that our sub-committees have mapped out by quoting from their reports read at a recent meeting of the tariff reform committee. The sub-committees on New York city, New York state and other states propose to carry on pretty much the same kind of work in the respective localities to which their work is especially devoted. This work will be, First, to assist in the formation of organizations interested in the discussion of the tariff question; to provide such organizations at times with funds to defray the expenses of holding meetings, and to furnish them with speakers. Second, to obtain fuller and more definite information as to the statistics of the various industries of the different localities, the number of persons employed, wages paid and the manner in which the tariff affects both employers and employees, and the effect of duties on the prices of necessities of life. Third, to provide literature and information for distribution.

"Of course, the furnishing of speakers can only be done in special cases. We do not offer to supply speakers wherever they are wanted, but we have a number of gentlemen specially prepared to speak on the relation of the tariff to particular industries, and other speakers who can be called on when needed, but we can only call on these gentlemen for special occasions.

"It is not our object to form branch organizations nor to absorb other clubs. We simply want to co-operate with existing organizations and to stir up the people of different localities to form independent clubs and co-operate with us. Every day we get word of the formation of clubs in different parts of the country, but they are not all organized on the same plan as ours. Some are mugwump, some democratic and some single tax organizations. We, however, try to keep in touch with all of them."

"Then the campaign of last year did not end the fight?" said the reporter.

"Not by any means. It is getting stronger and stronger all the time."

"How about the other sub-committees?"

"The sub-committee on the press proposes to continue the work begun during the campaign, of furnishing tariff reform news, discussions and editorials to newspapers in all parts of the state and country. It will, if possible, get up a syndicate of papers and furnish news items to all the subscribers, and thus make the work partly self-supporting. An enormous amount of matter was furnished by this committee to various newspapers last fall and was used by them and copied by other papers.

"The sub-committee on industrial statistics will continue the work of collecting and collating information about all the principal industries, and furnish the speakers and writers with the results of these investigations.

"The sub-committee on congress will prepare a complete record of every congressman, and a detailed statement of the political and industrial condition of every congressional district in the country."

The reporter asked whether the club had issued any literature bearing on special industries lately.

"Not this spring, as yet," said Mr. Warner, "a large amount of material has been collected and only needs to be put in shape, when it will be issued in extra numbers of our journal, Tariff Reform, in the same form as the various extras we issued last fall."

"Has the Reform club a large non-resident membership?"

"Very large. We have members, many of them active men, scattered all over the country, and their number is increasing."

The Reason in Four Words.

Brisbane, Australia, Boomerang.

This is all there is to the world getting wicked; monopoly is getting stronger; and monopoly would cause wickedness within the walls of heaven itself.

ETERNAL LIFE—WHAT IS IT?

Glowing Thoughts and Stirring Words From a Late Address by Judge Reid in Nashville.

What kind of a being does your conception of God make him? He wears a gold crown on his head and holds a scepter in his hand, and the principal reason why you profess to worship him is because he has the power to launch the lightning at you, and you rather fear he may unless you pay him the due amount of homage. Is not that about the truth of it? Then I see how it is that you are able to believe that hell is paved with the skulls of unbaptized infants; how it is that you can believe that he punishes the blind and the deaf because of their blindness and deafness; how it is that you are able to hold the monstrous belief that hundreds of thousands of men and women and children are murdered, in body and soul, by slow torture, that the children of Dives may have the opportunity afforded them of acquiring the benefits that result to human character from establishing charity soup houses. . .

Straight is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Few there be that find life? What does he mean by that? Not the life of the body, for you have that already (the beasts of the fields have that), but the life of the spirit—which alone can save from death. If you are born again, with the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount this time in you, though you were dead, yet shall you live. If you love the truth more than you do your money, aye, more than father and mother, wife and children; if you love justice better than fame or place or power; if your whole being tingles with hot indignation at the sight of cruelty and wrong, at the sight of helpless human beings made to endure the agonies of hell by unjust laws, and there is that in you which will not let you rest, but forces you into the fight, though defeat and death stare you in the face, you may take the word of all the prophets and the sages that your face is toward the light and your feet walk the road that leads to everlasting life, that leads to glories which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive. But if you can sit before a blazing fire, with your slippers off on an Axminster carpet and hear the icy wind gnashing its cruel teeth, and yet not hear the cry of the ragged women and children out on the street, in the darkness, or hearing, feel only the greater enjoyment from the sense of your own security and comfort—God pity you, you are on the bread and crowded way that leads to destruction. If you are of those of whom it is written, "This people honoreth me with their lips but their heart is far from me," though you be a bishop or an archbishop, eternal death is your portion.

"I am the way, the truth and the life!" Aye, verily, "Whoso believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." Aye, verily. But what think you the great poet of Galilee meant by the words "believeth in me?" Orthodoxy says he meant you must believe that he died to atone for your sin incurred by your great grandmother's disobedience in eating an apple. He meant nothing of the kind. He meant that if you believed in the spirit which was him—in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount; if that spirit, the holy spirit of love and self-sacrifice and devotion to all that is highest and noblest in you, the divine spirit, the spirit of God; if that spirit was in you, then life was in you, eternal life; and death would steal away from your presence like the darkness at sunrise.

The only way to believe in Christ is to be a Christ, a son of God, yourself. The devil can profess to believe in him, as a world full of the devil's servants do, but to be him, or in the faintest to resemble him, is beyond the power of the devil or of any hypocrite. "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect." Jesus gave no command that it is not within the power of the human spirit to obey. Men can become gods if they will but conform themselves to the laws of God. They can transform the hell they and their fathers have made this earth into the heaven Christ prayed might come. If anthropoid apes could change themselves into immortal human beings what is there problematical in the assertion that men can develop themselves into angels? But they can only do it by developing their nature in harmony with the eternal laws. That, and that alone, will enable them to put on immortality.

If you wish to escape the sting of eternal death, O my brother, strive, before the night cometh, to create a soul under the ribs of death, strive to be a noble man, a hero. You cannot make a hero out of yourself by going to church and making professions of religion. The awful boon of immortal life cannot be won in any such easy way as that. It is not lip-service that God wants from you. He wants the wagon out of the mire, and he wants you to put your shoulder to the wheel. He wants the Augean stables cleansed, and he wants you to go to work at that like another Hercules.

"In a world full of lips that lack bread,
And of souls that lack light,
There are mouths to be fed,
There is work to be done,
And life can withhold love and duty from
none."

NOTE-BOOK JOTTINGS.

"Unearned increment," like the bird of passage it sometimes is, recently flew up about THE STANDARD office's front windows, fluttered and sat there for a while, and then, alas, took wings and sped away again. These front windows look down directly upon the statue of Washington, around which it is usual for processions to march as a mark of respect. All of our crowd at the office supposed that on the occasion of the grand military parade of April 30, Washington's day, the statue would receive its customary honors. As window space commanding a view of the parade is being generally sold, our window holders thought of clearing away their desks, ranging chairs for spectators, and inviting friends to compete for the privilege of occupying them, the proceeds to go to some one of the single tax funds. For a brief hour several of us had symptoms of real estate fever. We foresaw the possible boom. We became speculators. We planned for a maximum of price with a minimum of improvements. But through circumstances over which we had no control, population was not to swarm to our windows, and the boom burst. The officials announced that the route of parade was to be along Fifth avenue, and not Broadway, above Waverly place. The location value of our windows on parade day will be zero.

The perplexed farmer squirming while the long fingers of protection are reaching into his pocketbook is pretty well depicted in what Stephen Harris, of Pauline, Iowa, writes us: "I understand that the manufacturers have raised the price of binding twine so that it will cost the farmer twenty cents a pound during the coming harvest. Last summer it cost sixteen. On Saturday, the 2d inst., the farmers had a meeting to decide what steps to take, and passed a motion not to buy any twine, but to stack their grain loose. If they do this they will probably lose more by wet weather than the twine would cost. In talking to some of them I noticed that they are more willing to listen to free trade talk than before. It will take a pretty heavy club to knock sense into most of them, but I hope the club is being made."

For the past seven years the typographical union of New York has employed the Australian balloting system, slightly modified. The union list corrected to the date of the election answers as a register of voters, members in arrears being disqualified. Women have all the rights of men. While two parties, meeting in caucus, nominate what are termed the regular candidates, any other candidate must be put in nomination on the request of fifty voters. The ballots are provided at the expense of the union. The names of all the candidates are printed on one ballot. The voters scratch in ink or pencil across the names of the men he votes against. There are about 140 union offices in the city, and polls are opened in each, ballots being sent by the secretary of the union to the chairman of each office organization. Repeating is prevented by requiring a voter to produce his card of membership and punching a hole in it when he votes. At the union election last week, at which more than 2,100 votes were cast, an independent candidate was elected over nominees of both parties. He was at no expense for tickets or canvassing. Had the union not placed his name on the official tickets he and his friends would have been put to the expense of printing tickets, distributing them about in the offices over the city, and finding at least one man in each office to act as ticket peddler for him. Under such conditions, the chances of an independent candidate would be slim.

By the way, Senator Laughlin, according to the Buffalo Courier, thinks all that is necessary for secrecy in voting is to permit a voter to pass behind a screen after getting his ballot from a party ticket peddler and before going up to vote. This idea is good—for a politician who wants to keep up his machine and to know how his constituents vote, yet wants also to pose as a reformer. It would permit the machines to work their assessments as usual, continue to give them the monopoly of nominating, allow them to have their bands of workers at the polls, and enable their inspectors and watchers to tell a man's vote by the size and tint of his ballot as he handed it up at the urns.

How far the power of the machines

reaches no one can tell short of much experience with them. A man said to me last week: "Do you remember that in the campaign of 1887 I called on you to help me get in my vote, and we could not make it? Well, last fall I decided to vote for Tammany. I went to one of their managers and exactly on the same presentation of facts as the year before my vote went in. I had better back out."

"Shall we compensate the land holders as we tax them?" One of our talkers gave me an original idea on this point the other day. He said: "Suppose we reach the foolish and unjust decision that landlords ought to be compensated for having the value of their land taxed, when the single tax comes into effect. We shall set out, say, to pay the New York landlords. I think that about that time Staten Island would come to the front and knock out New York city. The profits of business men, wholesalers especially, on Staten Island, with their smaller expenses, would be so great that railroads and shipping lines would soon have their termini there, and population would swarm to the spot. Before long the unearned increment bill in New York to be settled wouldn't amount to much. Meantime, the increasing land values of Staten Island would all go to the people."

Not long ago one of our single tax public speakers was invited to address a meeting in a district which did not promise an audience dressed in fashionable attire. A friend, calling at his house to accompany him to the meeting, found him in a dress suit, and thought it well to mention that perhaps the audience to be addressed might have a prejudice against dress suits. "I don't care," said the amateur missionary positively, "I'm not laboring to take swallow-tail coats off of those that have got them, but to put swallow-tail coats on those that haven't got them!"

I am told that one of the men who rose and made remarks at the close of a socialist's speech before the Manhattan single tax club recently, commented humorously on the speaker's assertion that all workingmen were striving for the same ends, their amelioration. He said, "Yes, just as the shad, the pigeon, and the cat are all struggling for something to eat. But they each go about it in their own way, and our single tax cat can't fly and won't swim."

A protectionist, lecturing before the same club lately, could not conceal his impatience with the stupidity shown by workingmen in favoring free trade. He declared that protection invariably reduced the price of the thing protected. "Look at the facts," he cried in a tone of irritation, "just look at them! Look at prices falling. Look at nails! Look at glass—! Look at wages!" called out somebody in the crowd, imitating the speaker's tone. It finished him.

My attention was directed lately to the long head of a man who had got ahead of his landlord in a peculiar way. With a partner he was in business uptown a few years ago, the firm's lease then having about a year to run. One day he fell to wondering how much the landlord would want to increase the rent on being asked for a renewal of the lease, and he reached the conclusion that it would be more than he would like to pay. So he approached his partner with an offer to sell out, and the latter paid him a good round price, basing his calculations of profits on the rate at which they had been running. The lease up, however, the landlord came in with a demand that if he would have fairly crushed out the business. The man who had continued in the business showed the landlord that he could not give what was demanded, as he was paying interest on the loan that had enabled him to buy out his partner. So the landlord was obliged to abate his demands. The man who sold out thinks he is now handling money that the landlord would have blackmailed him out of had he remained in business. —*GRIFFE.*

They Will Turn Its Face to the Light.
Portsmouth, Ohio, Leader.

The Columbus Journal is having a hard tussle over the single land tax question. It opened its columns to the discussion. Articles flowed in. It has printed some of them at least. It undertook to ridicule them out of countenance. It had the popular side, but the followers of Henry George will not down. They hasten forward one after another with their statements, figures, arguments, etc., until it seems they will gain the victory, and turn the Journal out of its own castle.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at

12 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the post office, New York, as second class

matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every post office in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

Both the Post and the Capital of Washington are doing excellent work, better than they know probably, for the single tax. The local question with which they are dealing is whether real estate should be assessed for taxation at its full value, or at a fraction of its value, as is the custom in Washington and elsewhere. Of this custom the Post complains that it makes the small property owner pay more than his share. Small properties are assessed at two-thirds their value, while gilt-edged properties, especially of the unimproved class, are assessed at a fourth and often as low as a tenth. The Post thinks also that those who have profited by increase of land values should pay full taxes "out of the wealth, which has come to them, not by individual exertion, but by accident of possession and location." This single tax pill is slightly sugar-coated, but it contains the genuine drug. The Capital speaks even more distinctly. It declares that if a higher tax were placed on locations and a lower tax upon improvements, speculative holdings of suburban land would come into market at a figure within the reach of modest purses; building operations would be stimulated, the revenues of the district would be largely increased, and a reduction of house rent would follow. This is but one of many hundred indications of the spread among newspapers of intelligence and knowledge on the subject of taxation.

The Press has made a genuine discovery in political economy. As with most discoveries of the protection school, it is like the school boy's discovery that if you subtract two pears from five peaches you will have three peaches left. It has learned that natural wages divide into cost of living, cost of amusements, and savings, and that it is out of savings that nearly all great fortunes grow. "They are the germ cells," says the Press, "from which spring Astors, Vanderbilts and Goulds." The Press has not yet discovered out of whose savings the great fortunes grow, nor why it is that the Astors, Vanderbilts and Goulds should spring from other people's germ cells. This is unfortunate, for until it finds out that its discovery will be of no possible value. Like Edison's original phonograph, with all the possibilities of a great invention it is really only a toy. But even as a toy it serves to entertain the economists of the Press.

The American Economist says "England is the free trader's paradise and her scale of wages is higher than in any continental country." Had it added that the continental countries where wages are lower than in England are protection countries, it would have told only the truth, but it might have spoiled its editorial.

While protection politicians are trying to wall this country in, business men, who have no special interests to serve through protection to monopolies, are trying to break holes through the wall. To the north efforts are making for a commercial

union with Canada, while to the south free trade with Mexico is demanded. The board of trade of Laredo, Tex., has adopted a series of resolutions in which they declare that the "highest interests of the United States and Mexico require the immediate negotiation of a liberal, just and equitable treaty of reciprocity, involving a comparatively free interchange of the merchantable products of both countries." The highest interests of the United States require that kind of treaty with every other country on the face of the globe, but the simplest and most effective as well as most economical form of negotiation is an act of congress abolishing the tariff.

Mr. T. D. Hinckley, of Hazleton, Ill., is entitled to the honor of the discovery of "the supreme error in 'Progress and Poverty.'" He tells about it in the National Economist. The supreme error, he says, lies in the proposition "to tax land up to its full rental value." If this should unfortunately be done, it would "make the possession of that all-powerful factor in the production of wealth the object of a competition, the fierceness of which would grow with our growth." And so on. It is clear that if the town of Hazleton should establish a system of water distribution, Mr. Hinckley would protest against any man paying for the water that he used. He would prefer to see one man own all the water, supply it in such quantities as he saw fit, and charge for it whatever he could squeeze out of consumers. Perhaps in that way he would avoid any "fierceness" in the competition to get water. And perhaps he wouldn't.

Mr. Samuel Untermeyer of New York, the president of the Harney Peak tin mining company, has returned from England, where he has succeeded in inducing English capitalists to invest \$2,000,000 in the development of his mines. The company has a capital stock of \$15,000,000, represented by the exclusive right to work the tin deposits of Harney Peak. It controls, so Mr. Untermeyer says, more than 160 mining claims, covering thirty miles of territory. Mr. Untermeyer further states that he should never have ventured to interest capital in the scheme had he not felt assured of "the intention of our government to protect new industries." This is his roundabout way of telling us that he expects to see a duty put on tin. "Our mines," he goes on to say, "will become valuable properties, instead of mere worthless holes in the ground."

Mr. Untermeyer is a modest man. Having secured control of certain "holes in the ground," out of which tin ore can be dug, he finds them so far removed from the places where tin is needed that it is cheaper for manufacturers to buy tin in England, and let the Montana holes in the ground remain unworked for a few years yet. He thinks this state of affairs is hard on him. What is the use, he pathetically pleads, of living in New York and owning tin mines in Montana if you can't force people to pay you for the privilege of working in the mines. And so he expects congress to pass a law, forbidding American manufacturers to buy tin in England, and forcing them, under penalty of fine or imprisonment, to buy tin from his Harney Peak mines or go without. That will put \$15,000,000 into the pockets of him and his fellow mine owners, every penny of which will come out of the pockets of the people who use tin, and every penny of which will cost at least half a cent extra to collect. It will also throw out of employment all the men who are now at work producing the things that go across the Atlantic to pay for the English tin; and in this way it will reduce the general scale of wages, and enable Mr. Untermeyer to hire the necessary laborers for his tin mines at a considerably lower rate. Mr. Untermeyer knows on which side his bread is buttered. In fact, he wants it buttered on both sides, and it is by no means unlikely that what he wants he will get. But it is hard on the people who have to provide the bread and butter.

On Thursday of last week the son of an English gentleman, who has made a large fortune by manufacturing thread in this country for Americans and in England for the rest of the world, was married to the daughter of a wealthy Pennsylvanian, a member of the United States senate. The bride was dressed in

white satin trimmed with lace, with pointed neck and half sleeves. Many ladies and gentlemen prominent in society were present, and the proceedings generally were worthy of the alliance of two leading families. The groom is said to have first met the lady who is now his bride while on a yachting cruise in the West Indies. He is a member of his father's firm, and the happy pair will reside in Newark, N. J., so as to be handy to the factory that makes their money for them.

On the same day on which these festivities took place in Pennsylvania a notice was posted in the Newark thread factory that the wages of the spinners would thereafter be reduced fifteen per cent. A member of the firm is reported as saying that even after the reduction the spinners would be able to earn an average of \$16 a week, which is from \$2 to \$4 a week more than is paid the same class of workmen at Pawtucket, R. I.

The people of Wilmington, N. C., voted at their municipal election last week to exempt all new manufacturing enterprises from city taxation for ten years to come. It is to be presumed that they did this because they had grasped the truth that taxation discourages enterprise. But it is clear that they haven't grasped the truth very firmly, or they wouldn't keep on discouraging the manufactures that are already established, nor would they look forward to a time ten years hence when it will be proper to discourage the new manufactures as well as the old.

OUR NEED OF A NAVY.

One of the matters for which the papers favorable to it most praise the last administration is its management of the navy department. Reviewing what has been done under the secretaryship of Mr. Whitney, the New York Times says:

Never before in the history of the United States has a party been able to retire from office with the satisfaction of knowing that during its four years' term of power it has done so much toward strengthening the defensive system of the country and at the same time developed so many material resources for the maintenance of a modern naval establishment.

This is doubtless true. Instead of wasting millions in repairing ships unfit for modern warfare, the policy of the last administration has been to build good vessels, and by a judicious placing of large contracts to induce private firms to set up the expensive plants needed for the making of heavy armor plates and monster guns. In this it has been successful. For the first time since iron began to supplant wood, and powerful marine engines to be developed, we have several iron ships that can both fight and run, while several others are in course of construction. Guns of great size have been made here as cheaply as in Europe, and heavy steel armor plates have been cast at a price only twenty-five per cent greater than they would have cost in Great Britain. We have, in short, got the nucleus of a great modern navy, such as those by which the European powers are trying to outvie each other, and in the Bethlehem Iron Works and the Hotchkiss Arms Company the expenditures of the government has brought into being a couple of infant Krupps. For all this President Cleveland's administration deserves whatever credit is due. But is it not the credit that belongs to the doing well of what in itself is bad?

What do we want with a navy?

To protect our commerce? We have no sea-borne commerce except what creeps around our coast. Protection has killed our foreign commerce, and on the ocean American passengers and American freights are carried under foreign flags. Yet even if we had foreign commerce, it would need no navy to protect it. We have but to agree to it, to secure to private property at sea in time of war the same immunity that the usages of civilized nations now give to private property on land. And even if this were not so the days of convoys have passed.

To protect our seaboard cities from bombardment? Who is there who wants or is likely to want to bombard our cities? And if such there were, is it not certain that the most effective defense of our seaboard cities from bombardment would not

be steel-clad ships such as we are now constructing and that are certain to be antiquated with the first great war that comes, but by balloons and sub-marine boats and torpedoes and electrical devices such as American ingenuity, if its springs be kept in strength, will bring forth whenever there is need?

In the beginning of the century, when compared with European powers, we were small and weak; when the black flag was yet known in the gulf, when Barbary rovers yet sailed the Mediterranean and passed beyond the straits; when the eastern seas were infested with Chinese and Malay pirates; when railroad and telegraph were not known, and it took months to communicate between places where now only minutes are required—then there might have been some reason for spending money on a standing navy. But what reason is there now? Pirates have disappeared, barbarism, on the sea coasts at least, has everywhere succumbed to the power of civilization, and all the principal ports of the world are linked in telegraphic communication with New York and Washington. The American republic, in the beginning of the century small and weak, is now, all things considered, the strongest nation in the world, while every decade as it passes steadily increases her superiority. Separated by three thousand miles of ocean from the rivalries and enmities of Europe, seated without hostile neighbors on a continent where none would dream of measuring strength with us, what foe have we, what foe are we likely to have, against whom we should need a navy? The notion that any nation on earth would be "tempted by our defenseless condition" to deliberately attack us, is worthy of a lunatic asylum. There is no power or combination of powers that could successfully invade us, and there is no power or combination of powers that could have any temptation to wantonly attack us. So long as we refrain from wantonly attacking others, peace with all the world is in our hands. It is perhaps the very greatest of all the advantages which we enjoy over the other great nations of the earth that so far as human eye can see we may rest secure of honorable peace so long as we prefer it to dishonorable war.

But "war may come." Yes; war may come. No one could deny that any more than any one could deny that Mrs. Toodles' daughter *might* marry a man named Thompson. But what use is there in keeping up an expensive navy to meet that possibility? The possession of steel-clad fleets and navy yards and foundries based on government contracts does not mean maritime strength. We may build and maintain a navy as great as that of England, but so long as we have no mercantile marine—so long as England carries our passengers and transports our freights on the high seas—we shall not rival England's maritime power.

The robbing system of protection has reduced us from the first rank of maritime peoples to the maritime rank of the Turks or the Japanese, and now the advocates of this same system, as one of the excuses for keeping up the blighting taxes from which some few monopolists profit, insist on giving us a "modern naval establishment." It will no more make us a naval power than the purchases of ironclads by Turkey and Japan make those countries naval powers. A navy without a merchant commerce is an exotic that may make a brave show in time of peace if money enough be spent on it, but that will surely wither in the blast of war with a commercial nation. To become strong on the seas again—to have again the American flag floating over the swiftest ships and the best seamen that any nation can boast, it is only necessary to give freedom to American enterprise and American ingenuity—to abolish the taxes that have driven them from the ocean. The millions that we are spending on this infant "modern naval establishment" of ours, if left to private enterprise by the abolition of duties on everything that enters into the cost of building and sailing ships, would soon give us a mercantile

marine that would be a better reliance in time of war than any navy; would soon build up foundries and machine shops able to turn out more and better and quicker work than any establishments that mere government patronage can create.

Standing navies and armies are incongruous with our institutions—they belong properly to monarchies and aristocracies, not to democratic republics. Our standing navy and our standing army are and have been since their organization utterly alien to the true American spirit. In them are perpetuated that caste distinction between classes, the outgrowth of European aristocracy, that the American constitution aims at in prohibiting titles of nobility. Before the civil law all American citizens stand on the same level. Between the president of the republic and the lowest department messenger the distinction is merely that of place and duty. But between the commissioned officer of army or navy and the enlisted man there is a distinction of kind—a distinction essentially and historically the same as that made in the worst days of European monarchies between high born noble and base born peasant. Between the lowest commissioned officer and the highest non-commissioned officer in the American army or navy, there exists the same kind of impassable gulf that exists between the son of an English duke and his father's butler—the one is a member of a superior and privileged class, the other is essentially inferior.

Two American boys enter the navy at the same time. One, the son of an influential father, is by favor of the president or some congressman sent to the Naval academy, or possibly in some cases where the congressman puts his privilege of appointment up to competition, he wins it by passing a scholastic examination, which, however it may test his ability to memorize and cram, gives no indication whatever of his peculiar fitness for a sailor. The other enters as apprentice or enlists as an ordinary seaman. The one becomes a favored ward of the government. He receives good pay, an expensive education, and has but to pass the examinations and conduct himself with reasonable propriety to come out of the academy a permanent office holder for the rest of his days. "Society" opens its arms to him as a member of a privileged class. The other is despised as merely "a common sailor." All the one has to do is to live, and he will mount by successive stages to the highest rank. As for the other, his status is not that of a ward of the government and life office holder, but that of a hired man, employed from time to time at low wages and small comfort, who, during his terms of enlistment, is held to his service by force, and who, no matter what his application and ability, can rarely hope to rise in the national service above a position which leaves him the inferior of the youngest and lowest commissioned officer.

All this is utterly opposed to the spirit of American institutions. Its theory is the theory of monarchy and aristocracy, not the theory of republican democracy. The reason assigned for the maintenance of privileged classes—of hereditary office holders and law-makers—by the defenders of monarchy and aristocracy is, that men are thus educated for their duties, and that the state thus gets better service. Whether this is true or not is beyond the point, but it is perfectly clear that if we are right in picking out and educating boys to become officers in our army and navy, then we are wrong in not picking out and educating boys to become judges, senators, commissioners, consuls, presidents—in short, in not putting the whole functions of government in the hands of a specially educated class of life office holders.

But this aristocratic organization of our standing army and standing navy is significant of something deeper, and shows that they are existing and not akin to our institutions. In the very nature of things standing armies and standing navies are inimical to democracy, and never, save in case of absolute necessity,

should those who desire the perpetuity of democratic institutions consent to maintain them. Standing armies and navies have always proved the ready tools of tyranny, and in every country in which they have been suffered to pass a certain point have proved the death of liberty.

This arises from their nature. The great virtue of the military service is implicit obedience, and to its inculcation the whole military education is directed. In standing army or standing navy the citizen is converted into a mere killing machine, which reaches perfection as it becomes ready to kill with absolute indifference any one whom it is ordered to kill. "Theirs not to make reply; theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do and die," is the spirit and the virtue of standing army and standing navy. And there naturally grows up in it a distrust and contempt for democratic methods and forms.

In the very disposition to strengthen our standing army and navy there is an unconcealed desire to create a force that may on occasion be used not against a foreign enemy, but against the masses of our own people. "There is nothing more timid than a million dollars except two million dollars," and the millions in ones and twos and tens and scores and fifties and hundreds that are piling together in the United States to-day are more and more attracted to the idea of a strong government. "Militia can't be relied on to put down labor riots, and we ought to have more regulars," is a sentiment that has greatly grown among certain most influential classes during the last ten years, and that is not without open expression in the press. It is an indication that should remind us of what the whole history of government attests, that while "a well regulated militia is essential to the existence of a free people" a standing war establishment is always dangerous. If it is a great one it is greatly dangerous. If it is a little one, it is less dangerous. But big or little, danger to free institutions inheres in its existence. For there is always a tendency in such things for the little to grow into the big.

For the man or boy who has no legitimate use for a revolver, the best sort of a revolver to carry, if he must carry a revolver, is one that won't shoot. On the same principle, the wooden navy which the republicans left when they went out was a better navy for us than the more efficient one that President Cleveland's administration has left. The old ships that could neither fight nor run, but did possess a marvelous capacity for undergoing repairs, fully served every real purpose for which an American navy is wanted—an excuse for giving a number of gentlemen pleasant life situations, for fattening a number of contractors, and for enabling the party in power to exercise considerable political influence. As it could neither fight nor run, there was less danger that it might be used to get us into some disgraceful war, such as Mr. Blaine had all but succeeded in getting us into with Chile at the time when his power was terminated by Mr. Arthur's accession.

For us to spend money on a useless navy is only a little worse than throwing so much money into the sea; but to spend money on an efficient navy, when we have no need for any navy, is a great deal worse, since it creates a constant disposition to use it.

This is a real danger. To win a little military glory; to rouse the miserable vanities and vile passions that masquerade under the name of patriotism; to excite the madness that in man, as in some other animals, is worked by blood, is the most potent resource of a governing class who wish to divert attention from home matters and secure an unreasoning, unquestioning support. God forbid that the lust for power should bring the curse of another war of any kind upon the United States. It is the only thing that can. But just as we add to our military establishment, so do we increase the danger.

That we in the United States have developed the beginnings of a great "modern naval establishment," is this a thing

to be proud of? Is it not like rejoicing that the beginnings of leprosy have been developed among a people that might be clean and whole?

Look at Europe to-day, cursed with monstrous military and naval establishments that not merely press with awful weight upon the productive energies of the people, but bar the way to all social and political reform. Look at Europe, so weighed down by these monstrous establishments that a nominal peace is becoming intolerable, and the only hope of advance seems to lie through a red sea of blood and a general bankruptcy of nations. Why should we take upon ourselves that curse? Why should we tamper or play with it?

War is the game from which both parties must arise losers! That is true of peoples. But it is not true of special classes who profit and wax strong at the expense of the masses of the people. Special interests find their account in war just as special interests find their account in protective tariffs, and concentrated special interests are always relatively stronger than diffused general interests. And what we are doing in building up a "modern naval establishment" is to develop those interests. To the masses of the people war always means suffering and impoverishment. But to the officers of a standing army or navy war means rapid promotion and enormously augmented importance; to contractors it means great fortunes; to politicians who can utilize its passions it means long leases of power. We cannot be too careful not to build up such interests.

"The empire is peace," said the Third Napoleon. In this he inverted the truth, and a little while thereafter was, to maintain his empire, forced to involve France in a war which has left upon Europe a legacy of evil that no man can measure. Empires, monarchies, aristocracies—all forms of tyranny—are born of war and the war spirit. Democracy, on the contrary, is the child of peace, and can only really grow and advance in times of peace.

Trace to their root all forms of tyranny and enslavement, all the widespread curses that the world over have degraded and embittered men and made the masses but hewers of wood and drawers of water; ask how slavery, serfdom, cannibalism, private property in land, and national debts came to be; how savage superstitions were engendered and how the slavish reverence for ruling families and classes has been developed and perpetuated—it will be found to be war and preparations for war. Civilization, in what does it essentially consist, but in the art or condition of men living civilly and peacefully with each other? In our most highly civilized society individuals no longer go constantly armed. Why should not nations also become civilized, and discard their war establishments?

Most advantageously situated of all the nations, it might be the grand destiny of the American republic to lead the world to peace. Not to a "Roman peace" gained through blood and destruction, held by massive legions and carrying in its heart the seeds of its own decay, but a Christian peace, based on mutual respect and forbearance—a living, deepening, growing peace, having for its foundation that golden rule that teaches us that we should act toward others as we would have others act toward us.

Some glimmering recognition of the true place of the American republic is shown in the proposal that has been made in her name that the nations should agree to settle disputes by arbitration. But how much more effective than any precept would be the example that would set before the world the spectacle of a great nation without a standing navy and without a standing army!

Of all the nations, ours is the one that

can most easily and most safely set such an example. Too strong to fear injustice, we ought to be too proud to do it. What do we want with a "modern naval establishment"? In the quick brains, the strong arms, the loving hearts of self-re-

specting independent citizens who have really "a stake in the country," the republic will find her only sure defense. Building and maintaining "modern naval establishments" can only divert us from securing that.

The real dangers that menace the republic are not from without, but from within. Standing armies and standing navies, heavy armor plates rolled by Bethlehem Iron works and big guns made by the Hotchkiss Arms company cannot guard against these dangers; they can only intensify them.

Bethlehem! The very word recalls the sweet story, radiant with a light that has glimmered down through centuries of iron and blood. Bethlehem, over which the star of a world hope stood, and angels sang of cheer to men of good will; where long seeking wise men bowed in joyful reverence before the lowly cradle of the Prince of Peace, who should turn sword into reaping hook and spear into plow share! Is it not suggestive of our so-called "Christian civilization" that iron works of this name should have taken the contract to roll armor plates? "The old gods are not dead." Many are the statues of Mars and Pluto that have Christ's name painted on them.

Instead of aping European monarchies, why should not the American republic take her proper place and lead the way? The millions we have spent on a useless navy and are now likely to spend on a worse than useless one, what might they not have accomplished if intelligently devoted to the advancement of science and the kindly arts. Only a small part of it might ere this have made aerial navigation practicable, and relegated European steel-clads to the junk shop, and pointed fifty telescopes greater than the Lick nightly to the stars.

HENRY GEORGE.

IN THIS LAND OF PLENTY.

The Condition of the Farmers and Business Men of Ohio and Indiana.

John Filmer, secretary of the New Churchmen's single tax league, sends us the following letter, which he recently received from a friend who had just returned from a trip through Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and parts of Kentucky and West Virginia. The writer says:

All along my route, which included many of the manufacturing centers, I found business in a dying condition. A country teeming with the products of the soil, fruit, corn, wheat, potatoes, cattle and hogs. Such a corn crop! the world never saw its equal. As old farmers told me, it seemed as if the grain on the cobs did not move along fast enough so as to make room for those that were still coming. I never saw so much corn left out in the fields through the winter as I saw this last month. All along the railroads and as far as the eye could reach were thousands and thousands of bushels of corn still remaining in the shock. And yet in the midst of this great plenty men by the thousands were idle. Why don't they work? Simply because there is no work. Iron mills, glass works, coal mines and a great many other industries have shut down and of course the men are thrown out of employment. This just simply means ruin to the tradesmen in groceries and dry-goods. And in due course it will reach the wholesale dealer. The farmer cannot sell his corn except at a sacrifice, and the price now to the farmer is in many places as low as twenty cents per bushel. It cost him nearly that to raise it after he has paid the fancy interest on the mortgage that blankets his farm. More than one-half the farms in the great state of Ohio are owned by the money lenders of the east. Farms in the eastern part of Ohio and along the banks of the Ohio river are depreciating in value. You don't need to be told that, you can see it in the business conditions of the dead towns along the great river. In Marietta I was informed by a gentleman there that on the previous Tuesday about 130 young and middle aged people left his district for the west and others are to follow. At that rate Ohio will soon get to be like Connecticut, where half the farms are for sale. Prices of all commodities are falling and every effort is put forth by houses to dispose of their goods. The country is full of drummers and they swarm on the railroads each prepared to undersell his rival.

The great boom in business that was to follow the presidential election has failed to materialize and I doubt if it will put in an appearance for some time to come.

Only Want the Values that Others Make, Richmond Dispatch.

A prominent member of the Astor family is quoted as saying: "I'll buy no more west side lots at prevailing prices until I see some more rapid transit."

MEN AND THINGS.

The story of James Sillars, as narrated in the *World*, is very interesting. Sillars, being discharged by his employers in Newark, N. J., with a certificate of good character, was naturally anxious to secure another job. Jobs being scarce in Newark he resolved to go to Boston to try his fortune there, leaving his wife and child behind him. Being a poor man, he walked. Pressed with hunger, he knocked at a door and asked for food. The woman of the house refused to give him anything, but advised him to go to another house near by. He went there accordingly, asked for food and got it. Then the man who fed him had him arrested as a vagrant. On this charge he was tried, convicted and sentenced to thirty days imprisonment. Escaping from custody he made his way home to Newark. But the long arm of the law reached after him and brought him back to Connecticut to serve out the remainder of his sentence. The *World* heard his story, investigated it, made it public and finally secured his release. Now Sillars is back in New Jersey and a number of charitable people have sent him money.

A very pitiful story. Told in newspaper fashion, with its touching features brought out in strong relief, and interviews with the various persons concerned thrown in, it stirs the sympathy of the most thoughtless. Surely it is a monstrous thing, that for no other offense than asking for food when he was unable to obtain work, a man should be cast into prison, stamped as a malefactor, compelled to herd with criminals. The *World* has done good work in pointing out the cruel wrong done to James Sillars, in aiding him to return to his family, in receiving subscriptions for his relief.

Yes, it is a pitiful story. It stirs your blood, doesn't it? You see the horror of it all, don't you? Why of course you do. It makes you blush for your country and your civilization. But just pull the story to pieces—dissect it into its various incidents, consider these separately, and see who or what is to blame for James Sillars's horrible experience. It is a maxim of the law, that where the injury is there the remedy must be applied. The law says it in Latin, but that is what it means. Now try to put your finger on the injury to James Sillars.

He was discharged from the Arlington mill in Newark. You can't blame the Arlington mill people for that. They had to discharge him, because they couldn't sell the things they employed him to make. There were plenty of people who wanted to buy the things, but as they couldn't earn money enough to pay for them, they had to go without. So the Arlington mills shut down and Sillars was discharged. Clearly the proprietors of the mill were not to blame.

James Sillars started to walk to Boston, hoping to find work there. This may have been a foolish thing to do, but it certainly wasn't blameworthy. Had he gone to Boston via Liverpool, of course he would have committed a crime, because the law says a man mustn't come from Liverpool to Boston looking for work, on account of their being so little work to do in Boston. But there is no law forbidding a man to walk there from Newark.

A woman refused Sillars food when he asked for it, and directed him to another house, whose owner she knew, presumably, would have him arrested. Was she wrong? Was she heartless? Oh! come now, read this tract "On the need of nerve in charity," and this one headed "Cold victuals," and see whether she was to blame or not. Would you have given Sillars anything to eat? Did you feed the last man who came to your door asking food? If you did you simply encouraged pauperism, and you know it. You knew it when you fed him, and knew that you were doing wrong for the sake of soothing your own sensibilities. How was the woman to know that Sillars was a deserving object? Will you believe any story a tramp may choose to tell you? You'll swallow a many lies if you do. And as for sending him to a place where she knew he'd get arrested, why, what else should she do? Tramps are a nuisance. They're a positive danger. They have been known to commit the most horrible crimes. The woman only did her duty by her fellow townsmen. Suppose she hadn't done it, and that night Sillars had robbed a house, or murdered somebody—how would she have felt? It is clear you can't blame the woman.

And the man who first fed him, and then secured his arrest. Blame him? Why, he did nothing wrong. On the contrary, so righteous was his action that the authorities rewarded him for it. He got \$1.60 for securing the evidence on which Sillars was convicted. It is all very fine to talk about blood money, and say unkind things, now that all the facts are known. But suppose Sillars had turned out to be a desperate character, a burglar fleeing from justice, or something of that kind—wouldn't you have praised the man who caused the arrest, and spoken of him as a vigilant law abiding citizen. If you wouldn't, I am very certain that his fellow townsmen would have done so. And the local paper would have glorified him as a shining specimen of sturdy Connecticut yeomanry. I don't think you can honestly blame the man.

Now go on with the investigation. Consider each person and circumstance in succession, and say where and on whom the blame should rest. Would you say to the constable who arrested Sillars, You must stop arresting tramps; or to the justice who sentenced him, You must refuse to be guided by the law; or to the jailer who confined him, You must investigate your prisoners' cases before you carry out their sentences? View the whole affair with candid mind, my friend, and I think you will have to acknowledge that the only people concerned who can with justice, or even with safety to society, be warned not to do it again, are James Sillars himself, and the people who have been sending him money since the *World* published his story. Sillars broke the law—no doubt about that. And the people who are sending him money are encouraging law breaking—no doubt about that either. Let things go on in that fashion for awhile and the country will swarm with sturdy beggars, and every charitable purse emptied. On the other hand, if every tramp is forced to serve a succession of sentences in the chain gang, until he gives up tramping, and if nobody gives anything—except of course to his landlord, which is different—save in return for actual productive work, why there'll be an end of tramping and of pauperism. And you surely want to put an end to pauperism, don't you? If you don't, you are simply an immoral person, and I hope no reader of *THE STANDARD* can be called that.

This is absurd, you say? Well, I don't deny it. On the contrary, I insist that it is absurd. But I defy you to dispute that society acts as though it wasn't absurd. Put yourself in the place of any of the actors in the Sillars drama, except Sillars himself and the folks who have been sending him money, and announce your intention to do differently from what they did, and see what will be said to you by the organized charities, and the political economists, and the ministers of that foolish Person who said, Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. Or go out and do what Sillars did, or stay at home and do habitually what the people who helped him have been doing, and see what will be said to you then. I don't envy you the experience that will come to you in either event. If you want a quiet life, better go with the crowd, and play that James Sillars is a humbug, and Christ spoke in paradoxes, and the only way to cure distress is by not relieving it, and God loves the world so much that he won't give it enough to eat, and you are right, and I am right, and everything is quite correct, and the best thing we can do is to stop bothering, and go to supper. Pessimistic philosophy! Bless your soul, what is modern Christianity but pessimism—a gospel of do the best you can and devil take the hindmost?

So it goes. Turn to whatever side we will of the social problem, a paradox confronts us. We put our thieves in jail, and flatter ourselves we are going to make an end of stealing, and lo! up starts a superior class of thieves, who have taught themselves to steal within the law, and robbery is more rampant than ever. We organize our charity, and incorporate benevolence by act of legislature; and swindling charity organizations spring up on every hand. We build almshouses to relieve distress, and develop a class who are content to live in almshouses. If we feed our tramps, we make more tramps. If we don't feed them, James Sillars has to suffer. What are we to do?

What are we to do? Why, learn the

lesson, to be sure. When a chain of reasoning leads to an impossible conclusion, isn't it foolish to say that the impossible is demonstrated to be possible, and so make an end of it? Isn't it clear that the assumptions on which the argument rests must of necessity be false? Is there any clearer mode of demonstration in mathematics than the reduction to absurdity?

Apply this method to the Sillars case. The foundation on which the whole cruel superstructure rests is the fact that James Sillars couldn't go to work. He was able to work. He was anxious to work. But he couldn't find an opportunity to work. And so, goaded by hunger, he broke the law and begged, and the whole train of circumstances followed. Apply the remedy where you find the injury. Find out why James Sillars couldn't work when he wanted to, and you will know just where the trouble is. If that wrong can be righted, there is hope for the Sillarses. If it can't be righted, then the sooner the Sillarses die off the better, and we may as well go to supper.

Opportunity to work. Think a little. Opportunity to work. That was what James Sillars wanted. A wild blackberry on a bush is an opportunity to work. A fish swimming in the sea is an opportunity. A vein of coal, a stratum of brick clay, a quarry of stone, an acre of unused soil—these are all opportunities to work. Aren't they? These then, and things like them, were what James Sillars needed. Has God been niggard of them? Is there any lack of opportunities to work? Go to James Sillars's home, in a little Newark suburb, and you will see such opportunities lying all around, vacant, idle, unused. Follow him from Newark to the town in Connecticut where he came to grief, and all the way along you will see opportunities for work lying idle, with no man profiting by them. Sillars had to pass them every day, every hour of his journey. He probably walked over them quite frequently. Now you know its a little ridiculous to say that James Sillars couldn't find any opportunities to go to work when he had to pick his steps to avoid treading on them. The trouble wasn't that he couldn't find them, but that he wasn't allowed to take advantage of them. And I will thank you not to repeat any cant about James Sillars not being qualified to make good use of any of the idle opportunities he walked past and over. Because that is Mr. Sillars's business, and not yours. You don't know what Mr. Sillars can do. You didn't make him. God made him. And God made the opportunities too. And the question for you to consider is whether God made the opportunities for Sillars's use, or whether he made them exclusively for you and a few other lucky fellows. Just stick to the question, if you please. If you will only do that, I don't think you can escape acknowledging that James Sillars has a right to use any opportunities for work he may find vacant, and that if we can only discover some way to secure him in that right, we can safely leave him to his own devices, and shut up the almshouses and the charity wood yards. If Mr. Sillars can't make a living then, it will be pretty clear that God never intended him to live, and the sooner he dies, the better.

How can James Sillars be secured in his right of access to the natural opportunities? It will not do to fence in a few blackberry bushes, or a bit of quarry, or an acre of soil, and tell him that's his share and he must do the best he can with it. It wouldn't be his share. He hasn't any right to a share of the earth—to give him that would be to infringe the rights of other men. What he has is an equal right with every other living human being to the use of the earth, the whole earth, any and every part of it. And that's a very different thing from a right to a share of the earth. Now how can he be secured in this right?

To state the question is to suggest the answer. If every man has an equal right to use the earth, and no man has a right of ownership in the earth; and if, as is clear, some parts of the earth give labor better opportunities than other parts, is it not evident that the only way to do justice, the only direct, common sense, effectual way of asserting James Sillars's right, is to insist that every man shall contribute, to the general fund of the community, the yearly value of the natural opportunities he is using? Confiscation, did you say? Yes, it would be confiscation—confiscation of the right to

make James Sillars stand idle when he wants to work—confiscation of the right to force him to leave wife and child unprovided for and go tramping and begging for food and getting into jail—confiscation of the right to confiscate his rights. The more such confiscation we have the better. And just that sort of confiscation, in just that direct and most effective manner, is the object of the single tax.

There are too many shirts in the United States—so many that nobody wants any more, and people have got to stop making them. That sounds funny, but the owners of the shirt factories at Jamestown and Bordentown, N. J., say it's so, and as they have backed up their assertion by closing their factories, it is evident that they at least believe it. They say that they have 960,000 shirts on hand, and they can't sell 'em, and so they're not going to make any more shirts before September, any way, and perhaps not then, and the people of Jamestown and Bordentown, who depend on the shirt-making industry for their livelihood, must get through the intervening months as best they can.

When you come to think of it, it is queer that they can't sell those shirts, now isn't it? I know several people who would like to have more shirts than they've got, and they say that the reason they don't buy them is because they can't afford to. And I have a suspicion that just that sort of difficulty obtains all over the United States. Evidently our blessed protective system needs patching up in one respect, at least. It prevents men from buying shirts abroad easily enough, but it doesn't enable them to buy them in the home market. And so, while men all over the country are in need of shirts, a single firm of shirtmakers have 960,000 shirts on hand that they can't sell, and the shirtmakers are standing idle. And this isn't the end of it by any means. Shirtmakers, when they stop making shirts, must also stop buying the things that they otherwise might have paid for with the wages earned in their industry. Necessarily that throws other workers out of employment, and gives the shirt market another shrinkage. And so the congestion goes on, first in one vocation, then in another, until all the producers are loaded down with goods that nobody can afford to buy. And then comes the smash.

May it not be worth noting that when we forbid men to buy shirts in the natural market—in the place where shirts can be bought to most advantage—we simply throw out of employment the men who would otherwise produce the things that would go to pay for the shirts? Isn't it possible that the see saw of congestion may be started in that way? Suppose the shirtmakers were forbidden to buy any canned tomatoes except of a certain brand. Would that be a good thing for them, or for the laborers in the canning factories, or for anybody else except the man who owned that special trade mark? Yet that would be protection.

T. L. MCREADY.

Another Southern Paper in Line.
Charlotte, N. C., Chronicle.

All over the country the single tax idea is gaining strength. What adds to its momentum, is the fact that as a general thing men buy land on the outskirts of growing towns, and then wait for the enterprise of business men of the community to push the town forward so as to greatly enhance the value of the property; and all the while, these land owners are claiming a lower valuation of their land for the reason that it is not built upon, unimproved.

Whenever any effort is made to boom a town, these rich land owners who are to reap the quickest, largest and most direct benefit, from the growth of the town, will sit back, and decline to in any way whatever contribute toward the booming of the place, on the grounds that they are not engaged in any business.

Men will not forever consent to increase the wealth of land owners while the latter do nothing to help themselves, or their neighbors, or the town. The remedy is the single tax, and it is significant that the idea is gathering adherents steadily and surely all over this country and in Great Britain.

The men who are advocating the single tax are not anarchists nor experimental cranks; they are men who earnestly seek in lawfuo ways to benefit mankind.

There is never a remedy sought before a disease becomes obnoxious and dangerous. Land owners who sit back and smugly watch their neighbors, by pluck, push and patience, build up a town and treble the value of land, while the real estate owners reap the benefits, may see in the growing popularity of the single tax idea, and the great increase in the number of the advocates of the single tax, a handwriting on the wall that ought to arouse them from their selfishness, and bestir them to remove the cause before the remedy becomes a necessity.

CURRENT THOUGHT.

Profit Sharing.

Mr. Nicholas Paine Gilman calls his book "a study in the evolution of the wages system"—an ambitious, but somewhat vague definition, that, like the ancient oracles, is of least service when most needed, since to understand its meaning one must first read the book. The idea concealed in the definition is that profit sharing will be a great improvement on the wages system; and the purpose of the book is to show from the records of experience that profit sharing has been found practicable in a great variety of industries, and has proved itself in such cases advantageous to both employers and employed. Hence Mr. Gilman believes the solution of the social problem is to be sought in profit sharing. "Its logic," he tells us, "is clear, its history is attractive, its evidence is easily followed." And he appeals to capitalists and laborers, to the press and to the clergy, to examine into the matter.

Mr. Gilman bases his argument upon a somewhat peculiar economic theory. In the simpler industries, he finds two factors of production—labor and capital. Labor does the work, while capital supplies material and tools; and each receives its natural recompense in a share of the actual product. In illustration of this system he instances the great Dalrymple farm in Dakota, "the biggest wheat farm in America," where the Northern Pacific railroad, as capitalist, supplies the land, Mr. Dalrymple, representing labor, does the work, and the wheat crop is equally divided between the two. Another illustration is the whale fishery, in which capital supplies ships, boats, provisions, tools, etc., labor again does the work, and the product is divided on a prearranged basis. The second illustration is less complete than the first, inasmuch as it leaves an all important factor unaccounted for. Mr. Gilman fails to tell us who supplies the whales.

In the more complex industries our author discovers a third factor of production, namely, skill, or superintendence. Labor does the work, as before, capital supplies material and tools, and skill superintends the process of production and disposes of the product. Labor is rewarded with wages, capital receives interest and profit, and skill gets a salary. Wages, interest and salary are fixed by the competition of the market. Profit depends on whether or not there is anything remaining after the claims of wages, interest and salary have been satisfied.

Now it is clear that if any one of these three factors can be rendered more efficient, there will be an increase of production. If capital supplies a good coal mine instead of a poor one, there will be more coal produced. If skill watches the markets more closely, the product will be greater. Or if labor can be persuaded to more efficient exertion, the result will still be greater product and a larger margin of profit. It is on the last of these three postulates that Mr. Gilman rests his argument for profit sharing. And the greater portion of his book is devoted to showing by facts and figures that profit sharing does so stimulate labor to increased exertion as to increase the product and consequent margin of profit.

As far as this assertion goes, there can be no doubt that he proves his case very completely. He gives the histories of profit sharing experiments in several countries, and in a large variety of industries. In most cases the experiment was successful—the laborers produced enough extra wealth to cover the profit share of labor, and leave something over to be added to the profit of capital and the salary of skill. In the few cases when it failed, the failure was either more apparent than real, or was due to special causes affecting particular occupations only. Mr. Gilman's explanation of the reason why profit sharing produces this beneficial result, is at once lucid and convincing:

The standing grievance of the master against the man, in every industry, is that the employee does not fill with zealous work the time for which he is paid. Idleness, carelessness, and neglect of the master's interest in securing a large product, are the commonest reproaches of the one who hires labor,

(1) Profit sharing between employer and employee; a study in the evolution of the wages system. By Nicholas Paine Gilman, Boston and New York. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.75.

directed against the one who sells labor. To get as much as possible for the ten hours, and to do merely as much as is convenient for himself—this, to judge by the employer of labor on a large or on a small scale the world over, is the besetting sin of the laboring man. This is the fact because he [the employer] measures their achievement by one standard and they measure it by another. His standard is the industry of the owner of the business, who has every motive of self-interest to put forth all his powers.

Self interest in the case of the average laborer leads him, on the contrary, to work only hard enough to keep his place and satisfy the master fairly. All beyond this appears to him superfluous.

Now, if the master can bring into play upon the mind of his hired man more of the same motive of self interest which is so effective with himself, he may look to see somewhat of the same result. If he dispenses with wages altogether, as in the fisheries, and engages men to work for a share of the product which depends entirely upon their own zeal and energy, he attains a result entirely satisfactory, so far as the labor put forth is concerned; he could not ask that it should be more interested and strenuous. If, as the owner of a farm, he lets his estate on halves, the result in energetic and persistent labor is good; the workman has no share of the risks or cares of ownership, and he enjoys one-half of the product, which he thus has a strong motive to make as great as possible. Profit sharing, whether in agriculture, trades or manufactures, is the adaptation of this ancient and approved system of product sharing to the conditions of modern industrial life. It not only allows room for the increased energy usually shown in product sharing, by supplying the familiar and adequate motive of self interest; it also improves upon product sharing by securing to the workman a regular wage sufficient for maintenance, at least, and thus it takes away the excess of care and anxiety, leaving motive enough to bring out full exertion.

If Mr. Gilman had contented himself with claiming that profit sharing was a good thing for employers of labor, and that these would be wise and lucky if they could induce their workmen to agree to it, we might close his book here, with the remark that he had taken a good deal of trouble to prove what few people would deny. But when he claims to have demonstrated that profit sharing is a good thing for the employed, and that they ought to ask for it and accept it gladly when offered, it becomes proper to point out certain weak spots in his argument.

Admitting his extraordinary assumption that labor, skill and capital are the factors of production, it may yet be asked on what ground any one of these factors can pretend to claim a share in the extra production due to the superior efficiency of some other factor. If the workmen in a shoe factory, by cutting leather more carefully and working more diligently, produce more shoes and better shoes, without using more capital, or requiring more superintendence, why should they not have the full benefit of the increased production? Why should they be asked to surrender any part of it to their employer? He would not feel bound to raise their wages if he provided an improved labor saving machine, or secured a more capable superintendent. Why should they be asked to do to him what he would certainly decline to do to them?

One of Mr. Gilman's profit sharing histories is that of Rogers, Peet & Co. This firm distributed among its employees, for the year 1886, a dividend of 3 1/2 per cent on their wages. A member of the firm, by way of showing the soundness of the profit sharing principle, asserted that although the working hours of cutters in the clothing trade had been reduced from 10 to 9 1/2, their cutters were "doing the very same work in 9 1/2 hours as they did in 10. This at least equal production under 9 1/2 hours as under 10 we trace to profit sharing." In other words, the cutters were giving their employers the equivalent of half an hour's extra work daily. Now, half an hour is a trifle more than 5 1/4 per cent of 9 1/2 hours. The cutters work was increased 5 1/4 per cent, while their pay was raised only 3 1/2 per cent. Rogers, Peet & Co.'s pay roll is quoted by Mr. Gilman, on the firm's authority, at about \$250,000 a year. Three and a half per cent on this is \$8,750. Five and a quarter per cent is \$13,125. If the employees throughout the house had their zeal stimulated in the same proportion as the cutters, they simply gave the firm \$4,375 worth of labor for nothing. This was unquestionably a good thing for Rogers, Peet & Co., but it is difficult to see the benefit to the employees. Mr. Gilman would hardly think of advising an employer to sell \$13,125 of goods for \$8,750. Yet he thinks the industrial problem will be in a fair way of solution if employees can be persuaded to accept \$8,750 for \$13,125 worth of labor.

This is one weak point in Mr. Gilman's

argument. Another, and an even more fatal weakness, in his failure to take any account of the fact that there are quite a few unemployed men in the market eager to sell their labor, and forced to sell it for what it will fetch, under penalty of starvation. If Mr. Gilman wishes to get an idea of the effect of this market full of unemployed labor upon the fortunes of the profit sharing employee, he might ask Messrs. Rogers, Peet & Co. what would happen in their clothing business, if the market were constantly over crowded with coats and trousers, just as good as theirs, which had to be sold immediately at almost any price they would fetch. The firm would probably tell him that though they might keep their old customers for awhile, and even satisfy them by giving a Waterbury watch with every suit sold, yet in the long run they would be compelled to reduce their prices to meet the competition.

Suppose profit sharing were universally adopted. Suppose every laborer, besides selling his employer a day's labor at the market price, sold him also an extra fraction of a day's labor at less than the market price. What would be the result? Simply this, that wages would diminish by just the amount of the average profit share, so that wages and profit share together would amount to what wages were before profit sharing was introduced. But the measure of labor would not fall—the profit sharing system would take care of that. The laborer who did not deliver his extra fraction of day's work every day would lose his profit share, and find his wages reduced from their old ante-profit-sharing figure by just that amount. Rogers, Peet & Co.'s employees are now delivering \$250,000 worth of labor every year for \$250,000, and \$13,125 worth of extra labor for \$8,750. Altogether, they furnish \$263,125 worth, and get only \$258,750 for it. Let the profit sharing system become general, and they will soon find themselves compelled to furnish \$263,125 worth, in return for only \$250,000.

Mr. Gilman has gone thus hopelessly astray in his "study of the evolution of the wages system," because he has been content to take things for granted, instead of bringing them to the test of experience and reason. When he introduced that illustration of the whale fishery in his preliminary study of the principles of product sharing, if he had just struck work for an hour or two, and insisted on finding out what factor in production was to be credited with the supply of whales, he would have got some unexpected light on the industrial problem, and Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., might perhaps have published one book the less. He would have seen that though capital might provide the ship and the provisions, the whale boats, the harpoons and the lances, and though the crew might furnish the skilled labor to navigate the vessel, pull the boats and handle the weapons, still the voyage would be altogether unprofitable if nature failed to provide any whales upon which labor could employ the capital intrusted to it. And so he would have come to understand that in the whale fishery the factors of production are not two, but three—labor, capital, and natural opportunity in the shape of whales.

Having made this discovery, Mr. Gilman, it is only decent to suppose, would have turned back to his Dalrymple farm illustration, and asked himself how it could possibly be that production on land should have only two factors, while production on the water has three. Pending this question, he would have compared the two industries analogically. He would have seen that Mr. Dalrymple, furnishing horses, plows, seed, harrows, reapers, threshers, bags, etc., is really doing just what the whale ship owners did when they fitted out their vessel—providing capital for labor to use in production. He would have seen that the laborers driving the horses, operating the machines, and doing all the rest of the work, correspond to the crew of the whale ship. And it might have occurred to him that the whales in the ocean industry are closely represented by the Dakota prairie in the land industry, both being natural opportunities upon which man can exert labor and use capital to produce wealth, but with whose creation he has had nothing whatever to do. Reaching this point in his argument, Mr. Gilman would have found himself confronted with the tremendous question, Where does the Northern Pacific Railroad company come in? It takes half Mr. Dalrymple's wheat crop—what does it do in

return? And considering the matter with a candid mind, he would have seen that to complete the parallel between the whale fishery and the Dalrymple farm, he must provide a man to own the whales and collect from the shipowners and sailors one-half their catch of oil and bone in return for permission to go fishing. The essential difference between the two industries is that on the ocean natural opportunities are free, while on the land society has permitted private individuals to forbid men to apply labor and capital to them without first buying permission. That individuals can find a profit in doing this—that labor utilizing capital in production can be forced to pay for the privilege of using natural opportunities, instead of betaking itself into some distant wilderness where natural opportunities are as yet unmonopolized—is due to the law of nature that makes production easiest where consumers are thickest. If whales frequented the harbor of New Bedford, and some individual had the power of forbidding or permitting their capture there at will, that individual would have no difficulty in exacting from the New Bedford whalers the very thing that the Northern Pacific railroad exacts from Mr. Dalrymple—a rent for the privilege of using natural opportunities. And in taking it he would be doing just what the railroad company does, appropriating under sanction of law, a value that would of right belong neither to him nor to the whalers, but to the whole community, including the whalers and himself.

If Mr. Gilman had studied over his whale fishery and his Dalrymple farm sufficiently, he would have seen that the factors of production can never be less than two, natural opportunity and labor, and never more than three, natural opportunity, labor and capital. And seeing this, a very little further thought would have enlightened him as to the real reason for labor's discontent with the present wages system. He would have asked himself, What ought the laborer to do when capital refuses to employ him? In the light of his newly acquired knowledge, he would have seen the answer plainly. Betake himself to the nearest unused natural opportunity, and there, with the aid of such simple capital as every man assured of work can command—a spade, a pick, a basket or a hoe—engage in wealth production on his own account. He wouldn't have to stick to it long. For if all the world's capital were in full use when he withdrew himself, fresh capital would be produced within a day, and would be powerless for production without his co-operation. Then the measure of his wages would be, not the pittance that some starveling of the market place would accept, but the wealth that he could produce by applying his labor to natural opportunity on his own account, plus whatever sum the competition of capitalists for the privilege of his co-operation might enable him to secure.

Why cannot the laborer do this? Why don't the army of men in New York, who want work and can't get work, go across the Hudson to the Palisades and set to breaking up the rock into paving stones, or move on to some of the idle land in and around the city and go to market gardening? Why should they beg for lodgings in the station houses, while there is a whole kingdom of unused land close by on which they could build huts? Why should they waste their time and break their hearts trying to oust Rogers, Peet & Co.'s clerks from their situations? If whales were as plenty in the sea as unused natural opportunities are around New York, the whalers would be after them in a hurry. Why don't the unemployed of New York do as much? *Ah but nobody owns the whales!*—nobody can sit in an office in London or Chicago, and say to the New Bedford sailors, "You shan't touch a whale until I give you leave, and I won't give you leave till you pay me in advance half what you can realize by catching the whales." A somewhat important difference, Mr. Gilman, isn't it? And so we ask that society should say to the men who occupy the natural opportunities in and around New York, "Utilize them as much as you please, the more the better—you can't utilize them without employing labor, any more than a whale ship owner can send his ship to sea without employing sailors. But whether you utilize them, or whether you don't, so long as you occupy them, you shall pay to us, the whole community, for whose equal use God made the rocks and soil and rivers of the land just as he made the

whales that swim in the sea, the value that attaches to them by reason of our existence and our anxiety to use them." And when once this reform is effected, the cry of the unemployed will cease and Rogers, Peet & Co.'s clerks can claim a rise of salaries without being told that there are plenty of men hungry for their situations at less than their present pay. And the more people there may be in New York, when that day comes, the easier will it be to produce wealth by applying labor to natural opportunities, and the higher will wages rise.

The natural wages of the laborer is the product of his labor. Less than this it is a sin that he should be compelled to accept. Less than this society could not compel him to accept, if it did not first rob him of his birthright of access to nature's opportunities. What labor needs is, not kindness, nor condescension, nor complicated schemes of profit sharing and co-operation, but simply justice. Once that is done, the fire of discontent with the wages system will die for want of fuel. Until that be done, the fire will rage with increasing fierceness. Mr. Gilman's profit sharing, so far from quenching it, would only feed its fury.

"An Antidote to Robert Elsmere."

Alan Thorne (2) is a goody goody story, of that platitudinous class that Sunday school scholars of a generation ago were compelled to read for spiritual edification. Its author seems to have been hoaxed by some humorist into believing that science—personified by the late Charles Darwin—expects to solve the mystery of creation. Robert Thorne, whose "passionate longing" to discover the first cause of things has been fostered by the study of Darwin, resolves "to rear his son in utter ignorance of the Christian religion, and to prove by this experiment that a highly cultured being, whose intellectual and moral nature were rightly developed, would result in a more perfect character than one reared in the nurture of the Christian faith." To this end he engages a German governess—also of Darwinian views—and so departs "to attend the meeting in London of a body of scientific men." An humble but pious gardener—name of Benson—then appears upon the scene, and several minor characters move in and out in a wooden manner. The upshot is that father, son and governess are brought into the fold, distribute gifts among the needy minor characters, extinguish a whisky dealer, and build a church. What sort of a religion it is that is thus recruited and enriched, may be judged by the following excerpt from a conversation between the son and the gardener:

"There is a good deal of sorrow and misery in the world, isn't there Benson?" The boy's tone was one of discouragement.

"To be sure there is, Master Alan. But don't go pesterin' about that. They ain't the capacity fer sufferin' that ye have, and some of 'em don't mind it all, never hevin' known anythin' better; and some of 'em would be worse off ef they was better off," said Benson, unconscious of the paradox his speech conveyed. "And it gives us a stope to whet our Christian graces on. Our weapons would get powerful rusty ef we couldn't brighten 'em by use. And this world would be like heaven if there weren't anything awry in it."

The publishers announces "Alan Thorne" as "an antidote to Robert Elsmere. The definition will scarcely be accepted by any one who has read both books.

T. L. M'CREADY.

Books Received.

ESSAYS ON GOD AND MAN, or a Philosophical Inquiry into the Principles of Religion. By the Rev. Henry Truro Bray, M.A., B.D., LL.D. Rector of Christ church, Booneville, Mo. St. Louis: Nixon Jones Printing Co.

FEDERAL TAXES AND STATE EXPENSES; or The decay of separate state power of excise under the federal constitution, and the compensation therein provided for it; and the relation of the general civil administration under separate state authority, to "the general welfare of the United States" under the federal autonomy. By William H. Jones. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

LARGE FORTUNES; or Christianity and the Labor Problem. By Charles Richardson. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

(2) Alan Thorne. By Martha Livingston Moody. Boston: D. Lothrop Company.

Fruits of Land Speculation.

SAN LUIS OBISPO, Cal.—Hard times are being felt in full force here, and mortgages are the order of the day. The banks allow six per cent on deposits for six months, and charge fifteen for loans.

FRANCES M. MILNE.

THE WORLD'S LAST CATA-CLYSM.

Described by the Prehistoric Man Resuscitated from the Polar Ice.

Robert Duncan Milne in San Francisco Argonaut.

About a week ago I received a message from my friend Burnham, inviting me to call at his house as soon as possible, as something very important was on hand in connection with his protege, who had been resuscitated in so remarkable a manner by Dr. Dunne and himself some four months previous, in September last. Though I had been absent from the city since that time, I had received an occasional letter from my friend dilating upon the remarkable progress that had meanwhile been made by his resuscitated guest and the intelligence and aptness he displayed in mastering not only our language in the matter of talking, reading and writing, but in the appreciation and appropriation of our modern methods of thought through studying abstruse historical and scientific works.

"I have had far less difficulty," the letter concluded, "in teaching Mr. Kourban Balanok than I conceived I should have had in the case of an intelligent and well educated foreigner introduced to me under similar circumstances. Come up this evening and judge for yourself. While, of course, we have talked matters over before this in a disconnected and cursory manner, I propose to ask our friend to-night to give a detailed and connected account of himself and his foreign surroundings in that ancient world before he became one of us, and I wish you to be present in the capacity of historian as well as guest. We dine, as you know, at six."

A quarter before that hour found me in the drawing room of the Burnham mansion, where, after being welcomed by the family, consisting of my friend, his father, and a maiden aunt, I was introduced to a distinguished looking stranger—Mr. Kourban Balanok—in whom I had no difficulty in recognizing the gentleman whom some four months before we had rescued so wonderfully from a living tomb. Though faultlessly attired in evening dress, I at once recognized the regular, clean cut, aristocratic features, crisp, curling and rather close cropped black beard, and bright black eye of our whilom patient. His clear, olive complexion struck me then as bearing a marked resemblance to that of the high caste Hindoo of our day, though the features were more pronounced and Grecian in type than is consistent with pure Orientalism. A quick glance of recognition passed across his face as he shook me cordially by the hand, saying at the same time to Burnham in excellent English, though with a slight foreign accent:

"I think I have had the pleasure of meeting this gentleman before—once—in your laboratory, was it not?"

"A Hungarian friend of my son's," whispered old Mr. Burnham to me, confidentially, as at that moment Dr. Dunne entered the room and engaged the others in conversation: "a count," he added, impressively, "whom he met abroad some years ago. Has been staying with us quite a time. Very pleasant fellow, Balanok. Funny name, isn't it?"

We adjourned to the dining room, where our little sextet dinner passed off very pleasantly, as old Burnham's little dinners always do, as his wines are excellent and the cuisine faultless; Mr. Kourban Balanok making himself especially agreeable by apt allusion and piquant illustration, which were sufficiently indicative of a very foreign origin and a civilization far different from ours.

Dinner over, as old Mr. Burnham and his sister both had engagements that evening, one of a financial, the other of a charitable character, Burnham proposed that we adjourn to his studio below, where we could smoke and talk at leisure.

"Suppose, Balanok," said Burnham, after we had arranged our easy chairs comfortably in a semi-circle round the fire and lighted our regalias, "suppose you give us some account of your past history, and what the world was like when you lived on it before, how you came to be imbedded in the ice where I found you, and such other matters as you think might interest us. We are all of us here now—all who took part in your resuscitation, and, although you have already told me much in a disconnected manner, I should like to know still more, and I am sure my friends here join me in the desire."

Burnham's strange guest grew grave and relapsed into meditation.

"It is all so strange, so inexplicable," he said, at length, "to find one's self transplanted as it were, from one civilization to another without notice and in a moment of time; to lose consciousness in a death struggle with water, and to wake up shortly after, as it seemed to me, upon yonder lounge, surrounded by strange people, wearing strange clothes, and speaking a strange language. I remembered the irresistible onslaught of the waves, I remembered my drowning struggles and recalled what I thought my death gasps, and had I waked among friends, or even among people whose costume or language was familiar to me, I should not have been surprised. But—what could I think at first?"

"My first impressions were that I had been carried by the current to some country of whose existence I knew nothing, and this was the more surprising to me, as I had at that time traversed every portion of the globe. Our facilities for travel in those days

were infinitely superior to those you possess now. Air navigation, indeed, was our ordinary mode of locomotion. It was not for many days after when I was able to converse somewhat intelligibly with my friend Burnham here and had gained some slight smattering of your language, that I began to realize the true state of the case. By degrees I comprehended that I had not been revived from a drowning, or semi-drowned, condition only, but that my body had actually been discovered imbedded in a vast field of ice in the region of what is now the North Pole. Still, even this did not surprise me as it might have done, as in the ancient world, as I have now learned to call it, the method of ice conservation of animal life was not unknown to our scientific men. It was not until lately, however—not till a few weeks ago, indeed—that I began to entertain the stupendous and almost inconceivable idea that I must have lain in a comatose condition for centuries, with the necessary conclusion that these centuries must far antedate and outnumber your eras of recorded time.

"This conclusion, I repeat, I have only arrived at very recently, as it is only within the past few weeks that I have felt myself sufficiently master of your language to permit of my dipping into your profounder scientific works. This has indeed opened up a new and most interesting field to me. It has proved, in the first instance, how utterly ignorant is the human race at the present moment of all that relates to its past history, and how deplorably it is misled by those who profess to be its teachers. I see that while the researches of your geologists and other scientific men have done much to eradicate the popular idea that the world is but six thousand years old, there still lingers, even among these, the idea that the existence of the human race upon this planet does not date very much farther back than the period of recorded history, and that your progenitors were debased and brutal savages, possessing only the rudest conceptions of mechanics and the useful arts, and none whatever of the sublime truths of science. While this is certainly true of your immediate progenitors, it is utterly erroneous as regards the race in the abstract.

"I have been reading with the deepest interest your histories of what you call the ancient world. I find that the records of these histories go back to the Egyptian and Assyrian nations, but that back of these you possess no records at all. Did the colossal pillars of Carnac, the stupendous moles of the Pyramids, the peristyles of Tadmor and Baalbec, the friezes of Persepolis, the winged lions and monstrous halls of Nineveh, spring into existence before some magician's wand, or were they the work of men as we are? And if the work of men as we are, how is it that the men who possessed knowledge of mechanics and arts sufficient to raise such memorable piles, and intelligent enough to devise such a beautiful and regularly written language as the Assyrian cuneiform characters represent, should have been able to write down nothing of their past, but merely the bare facts of their contemporary history? Does it seem reasonable that the immediate forefathers of these intelligent and energetic peoples were ignorant and debased barbarians? If they were so, whence came this sudden accession to knowledge and power? If they were not so, how and why was this secret of their antecedents lost? How is it that there is a point, in the not very remote past, where history breaks abruptly off, and beyond which even tradition is silent?"

"There is scarcely a people on earth," interpolated Burnham, as his guest paused in his argument, "which does not possess some tradition, more or less vague, of a flood. The Mosaic, or Hebraic, records go still further and furnish a history and even a chronology of the antediluvian epoch. The Chinese and Hindoos, on their part, claim a much more remote antiquity for the origin of their respective races, their alleged records stretching back twenty thousand years or more into the dim past."

"You will comprehend," resumed Mr. Balanok, "when I give you an account of the awful cataclysm, of which I was in part a witness, how there should exist traditions of such as you mention. You will also comprehend why—if my theory is correct—there should be only traditions and no authentic history of the times precedent to the cataclysm. I have studied the matter over in the light of my own experience, what I see before me, and the books I have read, and have come to a satisfactory conclusion on this point. I will now, if you like, give you some brief account of my previous existence upon this world, prior to the last cataclysm, and of the cataclysm itself, begging that you will not fail to interrupt and question me when occasion demands, just as I shall appeal to you upon all points where my knowledge of your history or scientific methods is deficient."

"To begin then, I was born in a prosperous commercial city, Entarima by name, upon the shores of an inland sea—by far the most important sea in the world of that period. It was roughly circular in shape, and corresponded to what is now known, I see by your maps, as the North Polar Sea—a sea as yet unpenetrated by navigators of your day, but which was, at the time I speak of, the great commercial highway of the world. Wait a moment, gentlemen, till I get yonder globes,

and I think I can, by demonstration, make myself more intelligible."

So saying, Mr. Balanok went over to the corner of the room where stood two large globes, one geographical the other astronomical, and proceeded to wheel them over to where we were sitting.

"Now," said our instructor, after he had got his globes in position and stationed himself between them, something after the manner of a schoolmaster addressing his class, "I perceive from this globe"—tapping the geographical one with his finger—"that the axis of our planet is nearly coincident with the center of the sea, on the southern shore of which I was born. You tell me, Mr. Burnham, that my body was discovered in the ice near what you now call the hundred and sixty-fifth meridian of west longitude, and in what is now latitude twenty-six north, in other words, at a point about one-sixth of the entire distance between the pole and the equator. I hope you will understand, gentlemen," remarked Mr. Balanok parenthetically, "that though I am not yet thoroughly conversant with your modern methods of computing angular distances, we arrived at the same, and even more exact, results by simpler methods, employing a decimal system of notation, which has been transmitted to you now through the Arabians. I have been studying your globes, and I find that my ancient home, Entarima, was situated in a latitude corresponding to twenty-six north. Now let us depress the pole of this globe so as to bring Prince Edwards island to the meridian in latitude twenty-six north, and in the ninetieth degree of longitude on that same meridian, reckoning from the horizon circle, we shall find that spot upon the earth's surface which was the north pole of my younger day."

Mr. Balanok proceeded to manipulate the globe, and presently announced that the north pole, thus located, would fall upon a point in the Mediterranean between Sicily and Africa.

"I have been studying your geographies, maps, and globes," resumed our friend, "with intense interest for the past few weeks and drawing inferences therefrom, and I have now arrived at conclusions so peculiar and stupendous in their character, connected as they are with phenomena of which I was a personal eye witness, that they cannot fail to utterly derange all your present conceptions regarding the history of the world we live in and of the human race. Neither is anything left to guess work, for I am able to verify, by comparatively simple astronomical calculations, the dates at which the various events I am about to relate transpired.

"My home was situated, as I have said, in a commercial city of considerable importance upon the southern shore of what is now the twenty-sixth degree of north latitude, or just outside of the tropic zone. You must understand that the human race in these days was much more highly and generally civilized than now; our scientific knowledge was far superior to that which you now possess; our ideas of the aims and ends of life were infinitely higher and nobler than yours—that is so far as, in my as yet brief sojourn among you, these have come beneath my notice; we had a history dating back about thirteen thousand years, till it, like your own, was lost in mythology and tradition. We, too, had dim, legendary records of a vast convulsion that overtook the planet and nearly blotted out the human race.

"Our scientific methods, as I say, were similar to yours in kind, though differing widely in degree. Your knowledge of astronomy, mathematics and mensuration is founded upon the relics that were saved from the last cataclysm, of which I am apparently the only survivor. We, too, had globes, and maps, and instruments, far transcending yours in nicety and efficacy. Our schools and universities did not confine themselves to abstract science and philosophy, as it seems to me yours mainly do, but investigated the inner meaning of all natural phenomena, reducing all the teachings of chemistry, physiology and mechanics to direct practice in their minutest details. The consequence was that we attained as great a measure of happiness as it seems possible for a race situated as ours is to attain. You still have traditions in your most ancient classical histories of a Saturnian, or golden age; these traditions are but the dim remembrance of human life as it was before the last convulsion.

"With such perfect control as we then possessed over all natural forces, the vast, unceasing and wearisome effort to sustain life, which is now the lot of the majority of mankind, was unknown. The force which it has taken you thousands of years to discover, and at the real powers of which you as yet but faintly guess—the force which you term electricity—was the tool, the instrument of our daily life. It was the slave of the lamp and the ring, which one of your story books tells about, reduced to as complete subjection as that genii and accomplishing results equally marvelous, for so they would now appear to you. As a consequence of the ease with which all results in the field of action—the term labor would be misapplied in the absence of effort—were accomplished, money, in the sense you now understand it, was reduced to a mere medium of exchange. Where there was no necessity for labor, there could, of course, be none for capital, which is only valuable as the purchaser of labor. The

precious metals, as you term gold and silver, had not been used as currency for some thousands of years before my time, and had been replaced by verbal contract or written memoranda of transactions. As gold and silver no longer represented values, the accumulation of these metals or their equivalents became valueless; and as their possession conferred no benefit upon the possessor, the great incentive to all the frauds, villainies and crimes which now afflict and debase human life, was absent. Agriculture, industrial pursuits, manufactures of all kinds were carried on in tenfold measure, but to such a pitch of excellence had our machines and mechanical knowledge been bought, that the production of the necessities of life was a pleasure instead of a toil.

"Art flourished in an extraordinary degree, painting and statuary adorned every dwelling. As there could be no poverty where every necessary or luxury could be so easily supplied, so there were no hovels, no-wretchedness or squalor. Two thousand years before the time I speak of, the various nations and races had, with the cessation of wars, adopted a common language. The continents now known as Africa and South America, with the now submerged continent of Kandafu, as large as Africa, situated then in the center of the Pacific ocean, where now the Polynesian islands are and what is now the region lying about the south pole, called upon your maps the Antarctic continent, were then the most favored and cultured regions of the globe. The Mediterranean was then the frozen Polar sea, and Europe and Northern Africa were one sheet of ice. Greenland and Spitzbergen were then in the tropic or subtropic zones, as well as portions of Siberia, as both the vegetable and animal remains discovered there—as I learn from some of your scientific works—conclusively prove. In no other way can we account for the presence of the carcasses of elephants, of the remains of magnolia trees, vines, bananas and other tropical vegetation in that inhospitable climate, or for the presence of the reindeer in Central France.

"We possessed the same domestic animals as you do now, and even a greater variety of the wild species, though these latterly had been nearly exterminated, and were driven to such remote fastnesses and jungles as here and there yet remained free from the encroachments of man. Our knowledge of chemistry, physiology, hygiene, together with our perfect control over the mechanical arts, enabled us to prolong human life to a term undreamed of in the present time, but which is vaguely shadowed by the traditions of antediluvian life in your Mosaic scriptures. Yet even with the possession of this ability, the population of the world, though more than five times as great as it is now, did not exceed its resources, so admirably did our scientific knowledge enable us to husband and conserve them; nor was death regarded with the dread and horror which it seems now universally to inspire. It was looked upon as the performance of a natural function, one neither to be unduly sought after nor averted. Assured as our race then was of the existence of a future state, to which our present life stood but in the relation of a preparatory course, and communing, as it did, with the spirits of the departed in a manner so free and unrestricted, as would astound the most advanced of your modern theosophists, death could not be regarded as aught but a transit from one condition of being to another.

"But it would be impossible for me to give you, in such brief remarks as I must necessarily restrict myself to at present, any adequate idea of the character or scope of the ancient civilization of which I formed a part. From the bare outline, however, which I have given you, you can in a manner judge of its inner nature. I shall now go on to tell you what I know of the terrible catastrophe which befell that happy and smiling world and at one fell stroke relegated it to the misery, the degradation, the ignorance, and the barbarism in which I see it now.

"My friend, Mr. Burnham, here—to whom I owe an incalculable debt as having been the means of restoring me to the privileges of life, as otherwise I might have remained for untold eons in a state of coma, neither man nor spirit—Mr. Burnham has told me that when he discovered my body in the ice, he saw, or thought he saw, at a considerable depth beneath, what looked like the streets, squares, and gardens of a city. From the necessarily imperfect description that he could give, I still gleaned enough to convince me that what he saw was really the remnant of my ancient home, Entarima, in which it seems only yesterday that I lived. This city being situated, as I have said, about what you now term the twenty-sixth degree of north latitude, and my supposed dead body having been found about the seventy-sixth degree, it follows that this change of location from a tropical to a frozen zone must have been brought about either by a change in the angular relations of the axis of this planet to the plane of its orbit, or by a change in the relations of the surface of the planet to its axis. The investigation of this matter was one of the earliest to which my curiosity prompted me, and I became at once assured that the latter of these alterations was the factor at work. The inclination of the earth's axis to the plane of its orbit—about twenty-three and a half degrees—is the same now as it was ten thousand, or, to speak more accurately, nine thousand eight hundred and seventy-six years ago at which time the

catastrophe I am going to tell you about happened—"

"Pardon me," interrupted Burnham, "I do not see how you can fix your dates so confidently and with such a degree of accuracy. How can you possibly tell how long you were lying imbedded in the ice? Since between the ancient world you are speaking about and our own there is unquestionably a period of time, regarding which history is silent, how is it possible to estimate the duration of that period at all, far less to estimate it so exactly as to compute the chronology of the past in terms of the present to a year?"

"By the simplest and most unerring of observations, in the taking of which the earth is its own chronometer," returned Mr. Balanok, smiling; "one of the first astronomical features which I remarked, after my resurrection, was that the pole star of the present was also the pole star of the past, and that consequently the relations of the equator and the ecliptic were still unchanged. I recalled that at the time of the cataclysm the vernal equinox, that point at which the equator is intersected by the ecliptic, called by your astronomers the first degree of the sign Aries, but which now falls in the beginning of the constellation Pisces, then fell in the constellation Leo. Finding from your astronomical works that the precession of the equinoxes is still fifty and one-fifth seconds of angular arc annually, as it was then, it was simply an ordinary arithmetical computation to reduce the distance in degrees between the equinoctial point of the present and that of the past to years. I found this distance to be one hundred and thirty-seven degrees forty-two minutes fifty-five seconds, which, at the rate of fifty-two seconds annually, gives the period of years I have stated.

"But to resume my narrative. In the early summer of that most eventful year a comet suddenly appeared in the southern heavens. Comets were no strangers to us in those days any more than they are now, and our astronomers had accurately computed the periods of such as recurred at regular intervals. The visitant in question, however, was one which had not previously been observed, and measures were at once instituted to calculate the curvature of its orbit, the time of its perihelion, and such other elements as might be of interest to people in general. Public interest did not, however, center very strongly upon the wanderer till it was announced in the journals—our method of printing, by the way, did not involve the labor of composition yours does, and was much more expeditious—that its nucleus would cut the plane of our orbit at a point extremely close to that which our planet would occupy at the moment. As the days went on, the comet grew in size and became a most magnificent object in the nocturnal heavens. Larger and larger grew its tail, until it filled more than one-quarter of the sky, and before the day set for its nearest approach, its tail only was visible in the sky at midnight, its nucleus being below the southern horizon. This alone sufficed to show the proximity and rapidity of its approach. It was now asserted by astronomers that its present course must bring its nucleus within a very short distance—a few hundred miles at most—of our earth, and though the supposition that it would do any damage was pooh-poohed by the wiseacres, still the common run of people could not help regarding the ominous phenomenon with feelings of alarm.

"The time of nearest approach had been set down for an hour after midnight, and, on the evening in question, when the sun went down, the streets of Entarima were thronged with people gazing at the weird spectacle. The tail of the comet which had, the night before, been seen stretching from the southern horizon to the zenith, had now disappeared, and in place thereof a bright, yellowish radiance filled the sky. The air was most sultry and oppressive, and I was quite prepared for the statement of one of our professors, who passed me on the street, that we were now enveloped in the substance, or *nimbus*, of the comet's tail. He also remarked that the speed of the comet, when rounding the sun at perihelion, would be equivalent to a million of your miles an hour—he, however, called it two diameters of our earth, or about sixteen thousand miles a minute.

"As the hours wore on toward midnight the air grew more dense and sultry. So deadly was the calm that a leaf or a feather would have fallen to the ground like lead; yet a perceptible tremor seemed to affect every object in nature. An indelible dread now settled upon the people. None went within their homes, but all, as by mutual consent, remained out of doors upon streets, or terraces, or upon the house tops. The domestic animals, too, evinced the liveliest symptoms of uneasiness. Fowls neglected to roost, and dogs ran yelping and whining piteously about the streets. After midnight, the nebulous light in the south grew more condensed and brighter. Brighter and still brighter it grew as the minutes passed, the tremor of the earth becoming all the time more and more perceptible. Meanwhile, a moaning sound, like the murmur of a distant storm, was momentarily increasing in distinctness and volume. Suddenly the southern horizon was crowned with a blood-red flush, in shape and outline like an aurora borealis, and a few seconds afterward an angry orb of fire, subtending some thirty degrees of arc, rose majestically toward the zenith, accompanied with a rushing noise as of a mighty but distant whirling wind. I stood rooted to the spot, overawed

by the magnificence of the spectacle, and incapable of thought or action. Utterly oblivious of my surroundings, all I could do was to stand still and gaze at the frightful phenomenon. As the seconds passed, the tremor increased in violence till it assumed the character of an earthquake. My eyes now turned instinctively north, in the direction of the sea. Could I believe my senses? Where a minute before there had been fathoms deep of water, there was nothing but a shining, oozy bottom, upon which scores of ships, that had been riding at anchor, now lay stranded upon their sides. The waters had evidently retired swiftly and noiselessly from the shore, but how and whither? Strain my eyes as I would there was nothing in sight but an oozy, slimy plain, hundreds of feet beneath me, stretching away into the dim distance and gleaming in the light of the weird radiance above.

"But as I gazed, the northern horizon became crowned with the same borealis-like flush that had suffused the south not ten seconds before—for all that I am telling took place more speedily than I can tell it—and from it rose an orb which I at once recognized as the sun. In an instant the scene was lit up with the full glare of day, instead of the baleful light shed by what I intuitively comprehended must be the nucleus of the comet in the south. The sun rose swiftly and perpendicularly from the northern horizon, till it reached a point some sixteen degrees high, and then I could detect no further motion. But while I looked, spellbound and paralyzed by a chain of phenomena, which seemed to set all the laws of nature at defiance, I became aware that something was transpiring far out across the waterless sea bottom which stretched leagues away before me to the north. I strained my eyes across the expanse and saw approaching a wall of water as lofty as a mountain and as regular as a line of battle. It grew before my gaze. I found myself calculating in a breath, from some headlands that I knew, that it could not be less than twenty miles away, nor less than a mile high, nor moving at a speed less than half a mile a second.

"And at that moment, as if moved by a common impulse, the vast throng of life about me found a tongue. It seemed as though the appearance of the approaching wall of water had unlocked the spell that had held them bound since the appearance of the nucleus of the comet, scarce more than a minute before. They now seemed to realize their impending and inevitable doom. Oh! the awful horror of that despairing wail. From tens of thousands of voices it rose with a sonorous force which swelled higher than ever the roar of the rushing waters that towered thousands of feet above us and engulfed us the moment after. It sounds in my ears yet. Then I knew no more—till I opened my eyes in yonder corner of this room."

When Mr. Balanok concluded his remarkable narrative, nobody seemed inclined at first to hazard any remarks upon the astounding events he had described. At length Burnham spoke.

"Your story, Mr. Balanok, involves so many phenomena that are without precedent or parallel, and so many apparent contradictions of what we are taught to consider invariable natural laws, that it seems to me difficult or impossible to account for them on any substantial scientific hypothesis.

"A minute after the nucleus of the comet rose from the southern horizon, the sun, you say, rose in like manner from the northern one. We, of course, know that the sun has no proper motion of its own relative to the earth, and that its apparent motion of rising in the east and setting in the west is due to the diurnal rotation of the globe. The only way, therefore, in which it is conceivable that the sun rose suddenly in the north is to suppose that the earth changed its axis of rotation and moved for a short time from south to north. But you assert that the axis of the earth's rotation has not changed in relation to the plane of its orbit. How then do you reconcile these apparently contradictory conditions?"

"You must remember," replied Mr. Balanok, "that all that I have described was the work of a little more than a minute, that I had no time to theorize then, and that, so far as my opportunities to explain satisfactorily the phenomena go, I am on the same footing as you are. I have, however, given the matter some study, and have reconciled the apparently incompatible conditions in a way satisfactory, at any rate, to myself. While we of the ancient world understood the principle of the mariner's compass, it was not of the same benefit to us as it is to you. The earth's magnetic pole is not even coincident with the true pole, but in the ancient days it was situated many degrees—some three thousand miles in fact—further south. I have, therefore, come to the following conclusions. The nucleus of the comet was probably composed of iron, and as it swept past our planet, from south to north, in close proximity and at such terrific speed, it exerted such an attracting force upon the vast body of iron ore of which the earth's crust is composed at the magnetic pole, as to cause that portion of the crust to follow its northerly course. We well know that the crust of our planet is merely an envelope or shell of extreme tenuity, floating on and incasing a fluid sphere of molten metal. It was an easy matter, therefore, for a comet possessed of magnetic properties for a certain portion of this

shell, to cause the shell to revolve, so long as the attraction lasted, upon the frictionless fluid body within, without disturbing its original direction of rotation. The comet, having a proper motion of its own, rose from the south, dragging the envelope of the earth with it, and the waters even more forcibly than the land, causing the sea to seem to retire, as I have described, and the sun to rise in the north, till it was sixteen degrees above the northern horizon, as it is now midnight in the latitude where I was found. The abrupt stoppage of the northerly rotation of the crust, when the comet ceased to exert its force, caused the waters of the seas and oceans upon the meridian of greatest motion to be carried over the lands in a vast tidal wave of thousands of feet high, as I have described. This motion would naturally diminish to zero as the extremities of the imaginary axis on which the crust revolved was reached, and accordingly the effect of the cataclysm would be less felt at these portions of the globe. It was sufficient, however, as I can now see, to swamp all the level portion of the continents, to destroy all traces of the civilization which then existed, to root up and overwhelm vast forests, to leave marine shells, as I have read, on your Rocky mountains, and to leave few of the human race but the mountaineers to begin the battle of life under the most toilsome and disheartening auspices.

"As for myself, the city of Entarima then lay in a sheltered nook backed by hills of considerable height, so that the waters soon became still, and congelation, at that latitude, at once set in. And now you know the main circumstances connected with the last cataclysm which overtook the world we live in."

Now, Name the Places Where the Demand For Labor Exceeds the Supply.

New York Press.

This is a grand country. The limits have not been reached, and there is enough yet for busy, industrious, thrifty hands to do. The rapid changes in population give a surplus of labor in some spots, and in other places there is a demand for labor above the supply.

Vulgar Fractions.

Sydney, Australia, Bulletin.

Landlord (on whose land gold has been found).—Well, yes, you may work my land conditionally on your giving me one-sixth of the output.

Digger.—Rather much, one-sixth.

Landlord.—Perhaps it is. Let us say a fifth—yes, I'll be satisfied with a fourth. I like to live and let live.

Offer accepted.

Consumption Cured.

An old physician, retired from practice, having had placed in his hands by an East India missionary the formula of a simple vegetable remedy for the speedy and permanent cure of Consumption, Bronchitis, Catarrh, Asthma and all throat and lung affections, also a nostrum and paint cure for Nervous Disease, and various cures, after having tested the wonderful curative powers in thousands of cases, has felt it his duty to make it known to his suffering fellow. Actuated by this motive and a desire to relieve human suffering, I will send free of charge, to all who desire it, this recipe in German, French or English, with full directions for preparing and using. Sent by mail, addressing with stamp, naming this paper, W. A. Noyes, 149 Power's block, Rochester, N. Y.

MISCELLANEOUS.

WHY YOU SHOULD USE Scott's Emulsion or Cod Liver Oil with HYPOPHOSPHITES.

It is used and endorsed by Physicians because it is the best.

It is Palatable as Milk.

It is three times as efficacious as plain Cod Liver Oil.

It is far superior to all other so-called Emulsions.

It is a perfect Emulsion, does not separate or change.

It is wonderful as a flesh producer.

It is the best remedy for Consumption, Scrofula, Bronchitis, Wasting Diseases, Chronic Coughs and Colds.

Sold by all Druggists.

SCOTT & BOWNE, Chemists, N. Y.

NOTHING

IS SO

GOOD

FOR

CHILDREN

SUFFERING FROM

COLD IN HEAD

SNuffles

or

CATARRH, HAY-FEVER

A particle is applied into each nostril and is吸氣. Price 50 cents at druggists; by mail, registered 60 cents. ELY BROTHERS, 11 Warren St., New York.

CATARRH

ELY'S CREAM BALM CURES COLD IN

CATARRH, ROSE-COLD, HAY-FEVER, &c.

PRICE 50 CENTS. ELY BROS. NEW YORK.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

The Case of John Smith and His Orange Orchard.

PASADENA, Cal.—I was both flattered and amused by the column and a half of comments you gave to my little John Smith squib, published in THE STANDARD of January 19; albeit the comment was in a facetious rather than logical vein.

An argument is never answered until answered at its best, and the fact still remains that John Smith's orange orchard was his very own by sacred right—the right to the product of his own labor—and any law that deprives him of both the earned and unearned increment without compensation is to that extent defective, not to say unjust. Even your wonderfully optimistic "Sairy Ann" tacitly admits that the single tax would confiscate their home.

John was not an "idiot" because he bewailed the loss of his all, nor do I think "Sairy Ann," whom you make to acquiesce in the confiscation of their home and perfectly content to have poor John begin the world anew at day's work, particularly "sensible."

I am not opposing the single tax doctrine; on the contrary, I think so highly of it that I wish it to be the expression of a perfect law—a law that will wrong no man. I am so jealous of its reputation that I wish it to bear the strongest light from every possible direction. It is bound to be scrutinized mercilessly and unless it will bear that scrutiny it will fail. If the law will not bear an interpretation that will relieve John Smith and analogous cases, let it be modified until it will. What is the matter with this for an expression of the law?

The community at large may rightfully take in taxes the whole of the unearned increment of land values *less the value of the earned increment necessarily destroyed*.

I believe the widely accepted law of eminent domain justly recognizes the right to compensation where improvements are destroyed. Such a solution of the difficulty should satisfy John Smith. He should say, "Tax me, but in heaven's name leave me something to pay taxes with."

Is not compensation just where the earned increment cannot be removed without destroying it, as in the case of Smith's orchard? So long as the orchard remained profitable for orange growing he could well afford to pay increased taxes; but when the unearned increment rendered that industry unprofitable, what was he to do? John is a simple minded man; he understands orange culture, but he cannot turn his hand to something new whenever occasion requires. Shall he, therefore, be despoiled?

The necessities of a growing population will always, to greater or less extent, crowd inferior vocations to inferior localities, from localities that have become superior and thereby deprive the owners of that portion of their property that cannot be removed without being destroyed.

The case of John Smith is by no means sporadic. Analogous cases may occur in any community. Pasadena is a good enough illustration. When I first came here in 1886 it had a population of about 1,000, and orange orchards grew very near the center of population. Many of them have been destroyed, and even now orange orchards are being cut down to give place to business blocks. In less than three years the population has increased to 12,000, making land values, according to Henry George, twelve times greater in that brief period. Now had the single tax been in operation during that time, I cannot see how improvements that could not be removed without destroying them were to escape practical confiscation; or, why there might not have been a score of John Smiths instead of one, as I have supposed.

WALTER C. LEAVENS.

It will be remembered by readers of THE STANDARD that Mr. Leavens put his question in the form of a parable showing an effect of the single tax in 1920. It was in substance that John Smith, having accumulated some money and being ordered by his physician to seek a change of climate, purchased a location adapted to orange culture and planted a grove. After he had sunk his capital and labor, less his support, in the cultivation of his trees, and when they were about to bear, a land "boom" made Smith's ground so valuable that he could not afford to use it for orange culture while paying the land value tax. Under the present system Smith would have been compensated for the loss of his orange trees by the increased value of the ground, most of which would have belonged to him; but under the single tax the community took that value, and Smith's labor and capital were swept away. The question having been put in the form of a parable, I replied to it in the same form, and perhaps, as Mr. Leavens says, in a facetious rather than a logical vein. The best answer in the same vein that the question called out was by a correspondent in Atlanta, Ga., who carried the parable to the point of stating that the board of aldermen of Mr. Smith's town indemnified Smith out of the public treasury for the loss of his trees.

Mr. Leavens objects that the vein in which my answer was given was not what the importance of the question requires. I agree with him, and dropping the parable entirely, shall consider the question as if it had been put in abstract form: When through local changes land values increase and existing improvements are no longer adapted to a profitable use of the land, how can the com-

munity appropriate the increased land value without unjustly depriving the occupier of his property in the improvements?

If the community should resume its function of common landlord, and should rent land to the highest bidder, the lease would in accordance with our principles contain a provision for the security of improvements, pursuant to which, when the land was next leased, the new lessee would be required to pay their value to his predecessor. In consequence of that obligation the new lessee would not bid so high as he otherwise might; and if the old tenant remained, as he would if he desired to (for he would have the advantage of not being compelled to buy improvements) his rent would be less than the value of the land, since other bidders being obliged to pay for his improvements, would not bid against him beyond the value of the land minus the value of the improvements. But, as Mr. Leavens understands, public leasing except of peculiar kinds of land is not regarded as the best mode of appropriating land values to public use. For many reasons the single tax is better. But on what theory shall we compensate a man for loss of improvements from inability to pay his tax? Clearly on the same theory that we would secure the value of improvements to the occupant under a system of leasing. The single tax is not a tax in the common acceptance of the term. A tax is a tribute; but the single tax is compensation to the community for exclusive use of a common right. It is only one mode of collecting for common use the value of common property. And if, in taking that value by public ownership and leasing, we provide for the security of private improvements in a way appropriate to the relation of landlord and tenant, there is no reason why, when we take it under private ownership and in the form of a tax, we should not provide for security of improvements in a way appropriate to the relation of tax consumer and tax payer.

But after all the necessity for relief in cases of hardship like that of Mr. Leavens's John Smith, is very much a matter of regulated imagination. As Mr. Scott said in answer to Dr. Freer in THE STANDARD of March 2, "Every piece of valuable land is worth to some particular individuals more than what might be called the economic rental value." In other words, valuable land is worth more to somebody than to anybody. What it is worth to anybody is a value that belongs to the community as a whole; but what it is worth additionally to individuals, who can make special use of it, is a value distinct from economic rent, and one the existence of which would give the occupant an advantage sufficient to protect him in all cases of normal and most cases of abnormal increase of economic rent. The advantage of possession would seldom be less in value than the worth of antiquated improvements.

Mr. Leavens wants "the expression of a perfect law." That he can have. It is that the public should take all land values to the last fraction of a mill and with the same exactitude leave to the producer the value of his product. But Mr. Leavens also wants a law that will wrong no man. That he cannot have. If an individual gets one penny of land value, every other individual in the community is wronged to the extent of his proportion of that penny; and if any individual at any time loses, by the operation of the law, one penny of the product of his labor, he is wronged whether the community gets the benefit of his loss or not. It is impossible to frame a law which will work with such theoretical nicety as to avoid the wrong in either form. A practical adjustment to theoretical perfection has never been accomplished in simple mechanics; why should we hope to accomplish it in social or economic science?

I do not for a moment suppose that so intelligent and thoughtful a man as Mr. Leavens demands an exact adjustment; but I put the matter in this extreme form to impress upon him and those who are bothered as he is, the difference between a perfect law and its practical application. This is not saying that theory and practice do not harmonize; but only that human ingenuity is unequal to the task of making a perfect application of a true theory. All we can do is to approximate. And in obeying the perfect law as to the common right to land values and the private right to products, which is a perfect law of justice, we can hope to apply it so far only as to do substantial justice. And that is far enough. No

community where substantial justice prevails will permit any of its members to suffer a substantial injury that is not common to all.

Aiming as we do at perfect justice, and rationally expecting and really requiring only justice, the practical inquiry is not whether under the change proposed somebody might possibly now and then lose property that was justly his; but whether the proposed change would not be a great stride in the direction of perfect justice. If the single tax will make work free to all who want it, secure substantial equality of opportunities, and give substantial protection to private property against the tax gatherer as well as the burglar, can we not trust to the future for means of preventing or relieving occasional wrongs to individuals which may prove to be incidental to our imperfect application of a perfect law?

L. F. P.

PERSONAL.

A reader sends us a copy of the Exchange, a weekly economic paper, edited by Dr. Montague R. Leverton. It is dated May 12, 1870. It declares for absolute free trade—a thing which at that time was rare. One editorial addresses itself to Horace Greeley in severe terms on account of his protection principles, and another disputes a point in the tariff issue with the New York Tribune.

At the election of Typographical union No. 6, held last week, for delegates to the annual session of the International typographical union, Robert Costello and Charles M. Maxwell were among the successful candidates.

This is one of the things which George G. Guenther of Streator, Ill., says in pushing the single tax before people's observation: "Think of it, you well-to-do fathers and mothers, that the savage sea of poverty, which is even now gnawing away the ground on which the middle classes are standing in such doubtful security, may some day engulf your children and children's children in its depth of misery, woe and degradation. Strive to create a juster existence for all that your own posterity may inherit it. Study the single tax and then go and preach it."

Solon P. Cress, of Leadville, Col., has a letter in the Denver Arbitrator in answer to this question put by another correspondent: "What effect will the single tax, if adopted, have upon the development of Colorado's chief industry? Will it increase or diminish the output of mines?" In answer Mr. Cress says: "In my judgment it would vastly increase the output, for the reason that it would destroy the monopoly of the use and equalize the opportunities in these unused bounties." Then Mr. Cress goes on to prove his assertion, and he does it in a very able manner, using as a basis the single tax argument.

W. W. Olmstead writes that he has been traveling during the past winter through the states of Mississippi, Louisiana and southern Texas, and that he is now visiting in southeast Kansas. Concerning this section of country he says: "I find that the land tax idea seems to be new and entirely misunderstood. The people of Kansas are as industrious a class of people as I ever became acquainted with, and I think the most refined in their tastes, as a whole, of any state in the Union; and I am quite sure they are the most monopoly ridden. In Laramie county there are 140 mortgage foreclosures. The land is gradually passing from the hands of the tiller of the soil into the hands of great land owners. Landlord and tenant will soon be the condition of the people here unless there is a radical change. The people see their condition and the inevitable result, but fail to discern the remedy, for the reason that the land tax idea has not been advanced here as yet. The people are intelligent, ready to perceive and quick of comprehension. I think the social and political conditions of the people are such that the single tax would be readily received."

William George, the editor and proprietor of the Vindicator, published in Erie, Kansas, is doing a great deal of effective educational work. He says he is having uphill work just now, but feels confident that his road will be smoother hereafter.

C. J. Buell of Minneapolis has a letter in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune against the passage of usury laws. He takes the ground that "no established rate of interest can represent the natural state of the market." He holds that "rates of interest naturally vary with the surrounding circumstances, being high where profits are great and low where such profits are small, always conforming to the law of supply and demand, and everywhere practically independent of usury laws." The editor of the Tribune especially complimented Mr. Buell.

D. C. David of Ville Platte, La., evidently has made up his mind that the members of the Farmers' union shall not be left to burst in ignorance as to the principles involved in the single tax. He is a persistent correspondent, and is making a deep impression on the farmers in his section of country. And he does not confine himself to his home papers. His writings frequently appear in other Louisiana papers, the last one heard from being the Baton Rouge Item, where he treats the matter of public roads.

A. S. Eldridge, on last Monday evening,

delivered an admirable lecture before the Henry George club of Johnstown, Pa., on "The distribution of wealth." The Johnstown Democrat printed the lecture in full.

Pennsylvania Spars.

LOCKPORT, Pa.—In the lumber camps just now, on the west branch of the Susquehanna, where the mellow white pine grows, one may hear some interesting conversation by men who study markets rather than maxims. During a professional visit a few days ago I passed a pleasant hour among men who have grizzled in the winter camps and on the spring floods of the Susquehanna. Logs, square timber and spars were discussed, and especially spars. The entire run of the conversation indicated that the demand for this high-priced variety of timber is wholly foreign. The "English market" and the condition of "English ship building" was subject of interest to the group of talkers.

"But then some other nations can and do build ships," said one.

"Yes," was the answer. "The Germans buy and use a great many large sticks, especially those ninety-six and ninety-eight feet long, if well proportioned. And they do so because they cannot get them anywhere else—the pine of other localities possessing requisite size is not fine grained enough to wear smooth." That grown in one locality, while large at the stump, does not carry its thickness into the nineties. In another locality the sticks are "shaky." And so on. Whether all the assertions were correct or not, I am convinced that not many places in the world supply a light, strong material from which ship masts a hundred feet long and as straight as candles can be made.

The "stumpage" of spars, it was said, range, according to quality, from one dollar to five dollars an inch, and those taken out on the west branch certainly are beauties. But I cannot imagine how the protectionists who handle them and compete with each other for a chance to supply a foreign demand that cannot be supplied from any other part of the world can see those sticks going through our tariff wall without asking themselves why "Yankees" have lost the art of building ships. Our woodsmen now base their calculations on the "English" market and politely offer their largest and best spars to the "Germans," and respectfully speak of the "German" demand for fine spars. "Ah," said one of the spar dealers, "the Germans are using the largest spars they can get!"

Why, think of it. In the days of American ship building we sold ships, not sticks. Americans used their own spars and sailed their own vessels. At that time there were no "Germans," but "Yankee" tars who d—d the Dutch and defied the English in every port in the world.

O. C. STEWART.

YOU CAN'T AFFORD

to spend a dollar on watches without getting full particulars about the best watches made, our Keystone Dust-Proof and our mode of selling them in Clubs at \$1 a week. We guarantee you absolutely against loss. Exclusive territory given to Active Agents. Prices, \$7 to \$10. Our special \$4. Watch is the best watch made for Railroad use. We guarantee our prices to be the very lowest at which any watches of equal quality can be sold, and we protect our customers fully. We refer to any commercial agency.

Full Paid Capital, \$300,000.

We have selling agents in every large city. We want AGENTS everywhere. Write at once to THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO., 904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

PHILA.

904



THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

WE REFER TO ANY COMMERCIAL AGENCY.

WE HAVE SELLING AGENTS IN EVERY LARGE CITY.

WE WANT AGENTS EVERYWHERE. WRITE AT ONCE TO

THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO.,

904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

SOME FOREIGN ITEMS.

Reynolds's Weekly gives some facts about the royal yachts used semi-occasionally by her majesty the empress queen. The original cost of one yacht, the Victoria and Alberta, was \$50,000, and it has cost for maintenance some \$40,000 a year for the past thirty years. No less than 258 men are kept for service in this yacht, which is used about three times a year. Another, the Osborne, cost \$500,000 and over \$50,000 a year is spent to maintain it. The Alberta costs \$15,000 a year. The Elfin \$7,500 a year. In all, the royal yachts cost \$170,000 annually, and the queen does not use any of them more than a few hours each year.

In Tasmania, as elsewhere, protection has its amusing side. The wife of a Victorian bank manager, staying in Tasmania, in ordering a ball dress from her dressmaker in Melbourne, is said to have written in these terms: "Let one of the girls wear it for half an hour, and be sure to put some old rustling round the neck." The object of these measures, by giving the garment the appearance of having been in wear, was to evade the heavy duty upon new dress goods.

A Mr. Caine has recently published some trenchant articles on the Christian missionary work in India. Among other things he says: "If India is to be converted to Christianity at the existing cost of missionary enterprise, even taking the most sanguine view expressed by any of my critics, we shall require the revenue of an empire. I have already shown that the net increase of membership in the Baptist native churches has been 746 in eight years. The expenditure in the same period has been about \$900,000. The net increase of the London mission in what their secretary considers their most favorable field has been 321 in ten years, and the expenditure has been at least \$750,000. We will say \$1,500,000 for about 1,000 increase, or nearly \$1,500 for each. This is costly indeed, and the progress so slow that it does not even overtake the natural increment of the adult population of India."

The Boomerang, a twenty-page illustrated weekly published in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, is a land nationalization paper. Some time ago it started a department headed "Wealth and Want," which is a euphonious rendering of "Progress and Poverty." It goes without saying that the single tax men have held the fort against all comers. In the meantime the government has been proposing to sell some of the common lands. The Boomerang puts the case as follows: The government wants more money. It can raise it in two ways—first, by taxing the land grabbers on the value of their holdings, or second, by selling the people's "commons." Shall we allow them to do the latter?

Count Tolstoi—the Russian novelist—regards Dickens with exceptional admiration, and has a portrait of him conspicuously hung in his rather bare workroom. He much appreciates the prose writers of America, notably Emerson, Thoreau, and the elder Henry James, and among living men Henry George.

Advocates of monopoly and special privilege play about the same old game the world over. The tactics of the protectionist managers in the Eden electorate, New South Wales, included the sending of a false telegram just before the nomination of every strong free trade candidate calling him home on urgent business. When the trick was thwarted, all the conveyances were engaged so that the candidate might not be able to get from the railway station to the nomination poll in time. An ardent free trader fetched the candidate in his private carriage, however, and the doughty champion arrived amidst the triumphant applause of his supporters just ten minutes before the closing of the nominations.

The statement having been made and circulated recently that the eminent historian, James Anthony Froude, had become a home ruler, a gentleman wrote to him and has got this reply: "The opinion of a person like myself on a great political question is not of sufficient consequence for the notice of the newspapers. Since, however, random stories have been circulated, and you think it worth your while to ask me what that opinion is, I can only answer that it remains what it has always been—home rule will be the first and probably irrevocable step towards the separation of the islands; it will increase the wretchedness of Ireland, and will be followed at no distant period by the break up of the British empire."

ANY PERSON CAN PLAY THE PIANO AND ORGAN WITHOUT A TEACHER, by using *Some Instantaneous Guide to the Keys*. Price \$1.00. No previous knowledge of music whatever required. Send for book of testimonials free. Address *The Teacher Magazine*, 19 Park Place, New York.

DENVER, CO.—Lots \$40 each in South University Place Annex; has high and beautiful location in the line of rapid growth and improvement. For information and plats address C. G. BUCK, 66 Symes Block, Denver, Col.

\$50. Earned by collecting Kirkman's Soap wrappers. Write to us for price. KIRKMAN & SON, 30 Catherine St., N. Y.

MONEY FOR YOU



In buying or selling our Watches, either all cash or in Clubs, at \$100 a week. Reliable Agents wanted. Lowest prices guaranteed. Exclusive territory given.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

TWENTIETH CENTURY.

Devoted to Secular Religion and Social Regeneration.

Hugh O. Pentecost, Editor,

Contains, besides crisp and pointed editorials and contributions from a corps of able writers, the Sunday addresses of the editor before Unity congregation. It is the only so-called "liberal" paper that advocates radical social regeneration.

Its columns are open for the absolutely free discussion of all religious and economic theories.

Twelve pages, issued weekly. Annual subscription, one dollar. *Sample copies free. All subscribers will receive a copy of Mr. Pentecost's book, "What I Believe."* Address,

TWENTIETH CENTURY PUBLISHING CO.,
No. 4 Warren St., New York.

VOLUME FOUR OF THE STANDARD.

NOW READY.

A limited number of bound volumes of THE STANDARD, in heavy boards, are offered for sale at the following prices:

Separate volumes..... \$3.50
Volumes 3 and 4, bound together..... 6.50
Volumes 2, 3 and 4..... 9.00
(Expressage extra.)

Address **THE STANDARD,**
12 Union square, New York.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY,

An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depression and of Increase of Want With Increase of Wealth—The Remedy.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

250 pages.

Cloth, \$1.00. Paper covers, 35 cents.

Half calf or half morocco, \$2.50.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

32 pages.

Cloth, \$1.00. Paper covers, 35 cents.

Half calf or half morocco, \$2.50.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

An Examination of the Tariff Question with Especial Regard to the Interests of Labor.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

Cloth, \$1.50. Paper covers, 35 cents.

Half calf or half morocco, \$3.00.

In Half Calf:

Progress and Poverty...... \$2.50

Social Problems...... 2.50

Protection or Free Trade...... 3.00

In sets of three, bound alike..... 7.00

THE LAND QUESTION.

What It Involves, and How Alone It Can be Settled.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

57 pages.

Paper covers, 10 cents.

PROPERTY IN LAND.

A Passage-at-Arms Between the Duke of Argyll and Henry George.

77 pages.

Paper covers, 15 cents.

FORTSCHRITT UND ARMUTH.

(Progress and Poverty in German.)

TRANSLATION OF C. D. F. GUTSCHOW

430 pages.

Paper covers, 35 cents.

PROGRES ET PAUVRETE.

(Progress and Poverty in French.)

TRANSLATION OF P. L. LEMONNIER.

48 pages.

Paper covers, \$2.75.

PROTECTION OU LIBRE-ECHANGE?

(Protection or Free Trade in French.)

TRANSLATION OF LOUIS VOSSION.

436 pages.

Paper covers, \$2.75.

PROGRESSO E POVERTA.

(Progress and Poverty in Italian.)

TRANSLATION OF LUDOVICO EUSEBIO.

352 pages.

Paper covers, \$2.50.

For sale by all booksellers, or sent postpaid on receipt of price. Foreign editions of these books imported on order.

HENRY GEORGE, 12 Union square, New York.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

FIVE YEARS REAL ESTATE FIRST MORTGAGE COUPON BONDS.

In sums of \$1,000 to \$10,000 each, bearing interest at the rate of eight per cent per annum. Interest payable semi-annually. These bonds are secured by first mortgages on Kansas City property, for three and four times the amount of the bonds. Prompt payment of principal and interest guaranteed at maturity. Interest collectable through your own bank, with New York exchange added. Recorded mortgage forwarded with each bond.

CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT

Issued in amounts of \$100 and upward, bearing interest at the rate of eight per cent per annum. Certificates of deposit are secured by first mortgage bonds deposited with a trustee, a special deposit receipt to that effect, from the trustee, is attached to each certificate, and is to be presented for payment of the certificate of deposit an absolute safe investment.

When ordering securities write your name in full, also that of your city, county and state.

J. H. BAUERLEIN & CO.,
Security Building,
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI.

GEORGE WILSON.

(Formerly with Henry Poole, London.)

Importing Tailor.

200 East Fourteenth St., N. Y.

"Tis not in mortal to command success; But we'll do more, Sempronius; we'll deserve it."

SAMPLES AND RULE FOR SELF MEASUREMENT SENT ON APPLICATION.

New Imported Fabrics, Latest Choice Patterns, An Elegant Selection.

The Best Looms in the West of England contribute to an entirely new and valuable stock of goods, which for richness of quality, durability of wear and moderation of price, possesses advantages not held by other houses receiving goods through resident buyers. Why? They were bought in London by G. Wilson.

WRITE AT ONCE TO
THE
WATCH
CLUB
CO.
PHILA.

ers that cannot obtain an express order—only those of one cent denominations wanted.

Plants by mail, 60 cents; 2 dozen plants by mail, \$1; 100 plants by express, \$2.50; 1,000 plants by express, \$15. Plants are carefully packed in damp moss and delivered to express or freight office, for which I make no extra charge.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

BELFORD MAGAZINE.

Edited by DONA PLATT.

Published monthly and devoted to literature, politics, science and art.

A complete long novel in each number.

The publishers of BELFORD'S MAGAZINE recognizing the fact that "revolutions never go backwards," have nailed the colors of TARIFF REFORM to the mast and "prepare to fight it out on that line" until the uninformed are educated up to the truth, that "an necessary taxation is unjust taxation."

The well known reputation of the editors, is a guarantee to BELFORD'S MAGAZINE, and that the monthly bill of fare, set before its readers, will be alike welcome in the home, the office and the workshop.

Subscription price, \$2.50 a year; 25 cents a number.

Subscriptions received by booksellers, newsdealers and postmasters everywhere, or remit by P. O. order, bank check, draft or registered letter.

Sample copies sent to any address.

New volume begins with the December number.

SPECIAL RATES TO CLUBS.

BELFORD'S MAGAZINE

New York.

NEW BOOKS.

Divided Lives.

A Novel. By Edgar Fawcett. Author of "The Ambitious Woman," "The False Friend," "A Hopeless Case," "Tinkling Cymbals," etc. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper Covers, 50 cents.

A Friend to the Widow. By Maja Spencer. Author of "Calamity Jane," "A Plucky One," etc. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper Covers, 50 cents.

The Veteran and His Pipe. By Albion W. Tourgee. Author of "A Fool's Errand," etc. Cloth, \$1.00.

A Boston Girl. At Boston Bar Harbor and Paris. Paper Covers, 50 cents.

Carrollton Perry's Poems. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00.

Kathy. A Novel. By Patience Stapleton. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper Covers, 50 cents.

Swedish Folk Lore. By Herman Hobrook. Translated by W. H. Myers. With 41 full page and other illustrations. Small quarto. Cloth, full gilt edges. Price, \$1.50.

Forence Fables. By William J. Florence (comedian). Cloth, \$1.00. Paper covers, 50 cents.

Miriam Balster. A novel. By Edgar Fawcett. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

Yone Sano: A Child of Japan. A novel. By E. H. House. (The serial just completed in the Atlantic Monthly.) Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

Under the Staples. A novel. By Walter N. Hinman. Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cents.

Adventures on the Mosquito Shore. By E. George Squier, M. A., F. S. A. With 60 Illustrations. 12mo, cloth; \$1.00.

Edition de Luxe of Poems of Passion. By Ella Wheeler Wilcox. Fully illustrated with photogravure, wood cuts and line process plates, by Rhodes, Rhodes, Cady and others. Large quarto. Cloth, \$4.00. Full Morocco, \$7.50.

Song of a Haunted Heart. By Minna Irving. With portrait of the author. Uniform with "Poems of Passion." Cloth, \$1.00.

The Wrong Man. A Novel. By Gertrude Garrison. Paper, 25 cents.

The Shadow of the Bury. A Novel. By Ernest DeLancey Pierson. Paper, 25 cents.

Aunt Sally's Boy Jack. A Novel. By N. J. W. LeCato. Paper, 25 cents.

BALLOT REFORM.

The explanation of Governor Hill's behavior in opposing ballot reform has often been given, but there is no harm in repeating it. It is this: A politician who is almost purely the product of corrupt politics and whose power is dependent on the sway of corrupting forces cannot be expected to aid the purification of politics.—[Syracuse Standard.]

No doubt the passage of ballot reform bills in New York and Pennsylvania would ruin the business of "the halls" in New York city and of "the machine" in Philadelphia; but "the halls" are the curse of New York democracy, and "the machine" is the curse of Philadelphia republicanism. Ballot reform would not disturb party supremacy in New York or Pennsylvania, but it would wofully interfere with the business of professional politicians, and probably drive them into some other way of earning their living.—[Philadelphia Record.]

Tammany is howling as only Tammany can howl against the New York electoral reform bill. This is by long odds the strongest proof which has yet come to our knowledge that the measure has much merit and ought to become a law.—[San Francisco American Standard.]

The democrat who opposes the Saxton bill is estopped by his own action from ever again accusing republicans of corruption.—[Brooklyn Times.]

How can any one who honestly wants a fair ballot object to a secret vote? This is the only thing that will stop bribery at elections, for no buyer will pay money to a man low down enough to sell his vote and then take his word that the proper ticket was deposited.—[Rockville, Ind., Tribune.]

Ballot reform is one of the greatest issues of the time. There is a large body of voters, including the organizations of workingmen who stand solid behind this measure, who are impatiently awaiting the favorable action of the legislators on this measure.—[St. Paul Pioneer Press.]

It is high time that that watchword (protection) should not enable monopolists like the coal barons of Philadelphia to fleece the consumers on one hand by demanding extortionate prices for their coal and to rob the miners on the other by paying them starvation wages at a time when their own profits must be abnormally large.—[Boston Republic.]

The next time lying demagogues, whether they be candidates for president of the United States or mere ward politicians, tell the workingmen of the United States that high tariffs mean high wages, their words will surely fall on deaf ears—unless the workingmen have mighty short memories.—[Indianapolis Sentinel.]

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

PRANG'S

NON-POISONOUS COLORS

for the use of children learning to paint.

These paints represent all the latest art colors and tints, and can be given to even the youngest children with absolute safety. They come mounted upon neat, tin palettes, or in tin boxes. They are all specially prepared for us by the most eminent manufacturers of colors in Europe—Mr. Gunther Wagner, of Hanover, Germany. They must not be classed with ordinary children's paints, put up in cheap form and made of injurious and poisonous materials. They are really fine art colors in convenient form for use and are especially non-poisonous for the needs of children.

PRANG'S OUTLINE PICTURES.

With these non-poisonous colors for children we issue several series of outline illustrations of familiar subjects as practice sheets. The original design is furnished in each case by some leading artist, and is strictly correct in form and detail. Directions how to paint them are furnished with every series. One specimen sheet of each series is furnished, colored by hand, in order to serve the children as a guide for harmonious coloring, and as an example of artistic work is the foundation of taste. The instruction is all the more successful because supplied in the form of amusement.

PRICE OF PRANG'S NON-POISONOUS COLORS:

Palette A, containing six colors with brush, 10 cents. Palette B, containing nine colors with brush, 15 cents.

Eagle Colors—Box No. 2, containing eight colors and brush, 25 cents. Box No. 4, containing twelve colors and two brushes, 40 cents.

One box No. 2 of Prang's non-poisonous colors and one package of Prang's outline pictures (eight in a package with an extra copy of one of them painted by hand and full directions) 50 cents.

Or one box No. 2 of Prang's non-poisonous colors and three packages of Prang's outline pictures (each package different in design) \$1.00.

To be found at all leading stationers, or will be sent by mail postpaid on receipt of price.

A RARE OPPORTUNITY.

PORTRAIT OF HENRY GEORGE IN COLORS.

Only One Dollar.

The man whose right principles and deep convictions have made the great movement for the single tax on land values thus far successful, must be dear to those who watch and approve his course.

But his features are not so familiar, and the esteem in which he is held has prompted many requests for the publication of his picture in worthy and permanent form.

Realizing this urgent demand, we beg to announce the publication of an entirely new and very striking portrait of

HENRY GEORGE.

It is in colors and is full life size, designed to be framed in an outside measurement of 17x32 inches.

This picture will be sent, on receipt of price, by mail, postpaid. Remittances may be made either by check, post office order, registered letter, or postal note.

L. PRANG & CO., ART PUBLISHERS,
Boston, Mass.;
NEW YORK—58 Bond street;
CHICAGO—70 Wabash Avenue;
SAN FRANCISCO—600 Commercial street.

BUY PAYMENT SAVE \$40 to \$500
THREES AS, HORSE POWERS, ENGINES, SAW MILLS.
No Money Men Entire AGENT'S COMMISSION paid to purchaser, Address The TMAN & TAYLOR CO., Mansfield, O. (And say where you saw this.)

Pennsylvania Agricultural Works, York, Pa.
Farquhar's Standard Engines and Saw Mills. Send for Catalogue. Portable, Stationary, Traction and Automatic Engines & especially. Warranted equal to any made.

Address A. R. FARQUHAR & SON, York, Pa.

BUY THE WRINGER THAT PURCHASE GEAR
The most labor Empire Does not grease. Solid White Rubber Rolls. Warranted. Agency wanted everywhere. Empire W. Co., Auburn, N. Y.

BLUEBERRY, Dewberry and Cranberry
Plants for garden culture. Full history and price list free. Address T. D. STAPLES, Portland, Mich.

Do You Want Money?
Have you One Hundred, One Thousand, or Five Thousand Dollars? You can multiply it by ten in one year by getting the sole agency for our watches in your city. We guarantee you absolutely against loss, supply advertising free, give exclusive agency, sole use of our club forms, and protect you from competition. You know that our Keystone Dust-Proof Watches contain everything essential to accurate time keeping in addition to numerous patented improvements found in no other watch. They are the Best and our prices the lowest. No one else can give you one-tenth the advantages we offer. Write at once for full particulars before your town is taken. We refer to Capital, \$300,000. Full Paid. THE KEYSTONE WATCH CLUB CO. 904 Walnut St., Philadelphia.

THE ORANGE GROVE

one year and a box of Florida Sea Shells only one dollar, or ten cents sample copy—contains list of Florida Lands for sale for cash, or on the installment plan.

Address THE ORANGE GROVE,
Liverpool, De Soto Co., Fla.

References given.

ASK YOUR GROCER FOR KIRKMAN'S
Borax Soap

Mrs. AGATHA MUNIER ATKINS will continue to receive pupils in solo singing and vocal sight reading at her residence, 223 E. 32d street, New York.

HOLLAND'S COFFEE AND DINING ROOMS
154 Fourth avenue, Bet. 13th and 14th sts.

JAMES BOGAN, PRINCIPAL AGENT
for James Means' \$3 and \$4 shoes. 226 BOWERY, near Prince street.

WE PAY AGENTS \$65 to \$100 Per Month SALARY
AND ALL EXPENSES. To travel or for local work; state which preferred, also salary wanted. SLOAN & CO., Manufacturers, 294 George St., Cincinnati, O.

CONCORD CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY (Ltd.)
104 Elm street, cor. Canal, N. Y.

BOOK, JOB AND NEWSPAPER PRINTING.

AGENTS WANTED
Everywhere for the ARNOLD AUTOMATIC STEAM COOKER
\$15 to \$150 per month easily made.
This is a new device. Apply at once.
WILSON GARTLE & CO., Rochester, N. Y.

HOLMAN'S PULMONIC SYRUP is the best Cough Remedy. Prices, 25c, 50c, and \$1.00. Denot. 381 Fourth ave., New York.

PRIVATE INSTRUCTION in the Ancient Greek, Mathematics and Science by an experienced college graduate. Rapid preparation for college examinations and for professional and commercial pursuits. Persons of neglected education receive special attention. Address PROF. LOWSON, 689 President street, Brooklyn.

SINGLE TAX MEN!
Help spread the truth! 1,000 stickers, assorted sizes, with single tax mottoes and doctrines, \$1; 100 note-heads and envelopes printed, with card and mottoes, \$1.50 for \$3. All postpaid. Cards, circulars, tracts, etc., at lowest prices. C. G. KIDDER, Box 651, Orange, Mass.

THE SINGLE TAX MILITARY BAND AND ORCHESTRA JAMES BEGGE, Director. Music furnished for all occasions. Address 151 SEVENTH AVENUE, BROOKLYN.

CURE FOR THE DEAF
Peck's Pat. Improved Cushioned Ear Drums. **PERFECTLY RESTORE THE HEARING** whether Deafness is caused by colds, fever or injuries to the natural drums. Invisible, comfortable, always in position. Single, conversation, whisper heard distinctly. Successful where all other remedies failed. Sold only by F. H. BISCO, 663 Broadway, New York. Write or call for illustrated book of prices FREE.

Pears' Soap

HENRY WARD BEECHER WROTE:



"If CLEANLINESS is next to GODLINESS, soap must be considered as a means of GRACE, and a clergyman who recommends MORAL things should be willing to recommend soap. I am told that my commendation of PEARS' Soap has opened for it a large sale in the UNITED STATES. I am willing to stand by every word in favor of it I ever uttered. A man must be fastidious indeed who is not satisfied with it."

PEARS' is the best, the most elegant and the most economical of all soaps for GENERAL TOILET PURPOSES. It is not only the most attractive, but the PUREST and CLEANEST. It is used and recommended by thousands of intelligent mothers throughout the civilized world, because, while serving as a detergent and cleanser, its emollient properties prevent the chafing and discomforts to which infants are so liable. It has been established in London 100 years as a COMPLEXION SOAP, has obtained 15 International Awards, and is now sold in every city in the world. It can be had of nearly all Druggists in the United States; but BE SURE THAT YOU GET THE GENUINE, as there are worthless imitations.

BEECHAM'S PILLS

For Bilious and Nervous Disorders, such as, Wind and Pain in the Stomach, Sick Headache, Giddiness, Fullness, and Swelling after Meals, Dizziness and Drowsiness, Cold Chills, Flushings of Heat, Loss of Appetite, Shortness of Breath, Constiveness, Nervous, Blisters on the Skin, Disturbed Sleep, Frightful Dreams, and all Nervous and Trembling Sensations, &c. THE FIRST DOSE WILL GIVE RELIEF IN TWENTY MINUTES. There is no fiction. Every sufferer is earnestly invited to try one box of these Pills, and they will be acknowledged to be a Wonderful Medicine.—"Worth a guinea a box."

BEECHAM'S PILLS, taken as directed, will quickly restore females to complete health. For a WEAK STOMACH; IMPAIRED DIGESTION; DISORDERED LIVER; they ACT LIKE MAGIC:—few doses will work wonders upon the Vital Organs; Strengthening the muscular System; restoring long lost Complexion; bringing back the keen edge of appetite, and arousing with the ROSEBUD OF HEALTH the whole physical energy of the human frame. These are "fact's" admitted by thousands, in all classes of society, and one of the best guarantees to the Nervous and Delirious is that BEECHAM'S PILLS HAVE THE LARGEST SALE OF ANY PATENT MEDICINE IN THE WORLD. Full directions with each box.

Prepared only by THOS. BEECHAM, St. Helens, Lancashire, England. Sold by Druggists generally. B. F. ALLEN & CO., 365 and 367 Canal St., New York, Sole Agents for the United States, who, (if your druggist does not keep them), WILL MAIL BEECHAM'S PILLS ON RECEIPT OF PRICE, 25 CENTS A BOX. But inquire first of your druggist. In ordering mention THE STANDARD.

BRIGGS' PIANOS
C. C. BRIGGS & CO.
5 APPLETON ST. BOSTON MASS.
MANUFACTURERS OF
GRAND, SQUARE & UPRIGHT
PIANO FORTEs

GRACEFUL DESIGNS • SOLID CONSTRUCTION & MATCHLESS TONE • BEAUTIFUL FINISH.



A Typewriter made to meet the modern want for a machine which prints directly from type, uses no ribbon, aligns permanently at point of printing, is light, compact, durable and—in a word—is built on scientific principles.

A TRIUMPH OF MECHANICAL SKILL.

SEND FOR DESCRIPTIVE MATTER.

MUIR, HAWLEY & MAYO CO.,

SOLE AGENTS,

343 Broadway, New York.

AN EXTRAORDINARY OFFER

TO ALL WANTING EMPLOYMENT.

We want live, energetic agents in every county in the United States and Canada to sell a patent article of great merit, on its merits. An article having a large sale, paying over 100 per cent profit, having no competitor, and on which the agent is protected in the exclusive sale by a deed given for each and every county he may secure from us. With all these advantages to our agents, and the fact is that it is an article that can be sold to every householder, it might not be necessary to make an extraordinary offer to secure good agents at once, but we have concluded to make it to show, not only our confidence in the merits of our invention, but in its salability by any agent that will handle it with energy. Our agents now at work are making from \$100 to \$300 a month clear, and this fact makes it safe for us to make our offer to all who are out of employment. Any agent that will give our business a thirty days trial and full to clear at least \$100 in this time, above all expenses, can return all goods unshipped to us and we will refund the money paid for them. No such expense will be incurred by any agent that comes to us. We will double this amount. Our large descriptive circulars explain our offer fully, and these we wish to send to everyone out of employment who will send in three one cent stamps for postage. Send at once and secure the agency in time for the boom, and go to work on the terms named in our extraordinary offer.

Address at once, National Novelty Co.,

61 Smithfield St., Pittsburg, Pa.